

Volume I

No. 1 - 21



Saturday
12th July, 1952

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part II - Proceedings Other than Questions and Answers)

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated.....20.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

3675

3676

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE
Saturday, 12th July, 1952.

*The House met at a Quarter Past
Nine of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions Part I not published.)

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED SPEECH OF SHRI SUNDARAYYA

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara—South): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me permission under rule 199 of the Rules of Procedure to raise a question which, in my view, concerns a privilege of the Committee of Privileges.

I do not think it is necessary to argue at any length that a Committee which has been constituted by you is entitled to expect that no part of its proceedings will be published either prematurely or in an unauthorised fashion. I am raising this matter because I want to invite your attention and the attention of the House to a report which has been published, and which, to me, seems to be much more serious than either premature or unauthorised.

About two or three weeks ago, on a statement made by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Communist party in this House, Mr. Gopalan, you were pleased to refer the question of the authenticity of certain documents placed on the Table of the House by Dr. Satyanarayan Sinha, and from which documents he had made extensive quotations in the course of his speech on the Defence estimates, to the Committee of Privileges. So far the Committee has not made any report. To my great surprise, I saw in the *Times of India*, a few days ago, a reference to the proceedings of the Committee in regard to this matter. I

have before me the Delhi Edition of the *Times of India* of the 5th July. On page five of that issue, there is a fairly detailed report of a speech alleged to have been made by Mr. Sundarayya, who is the Leader of the Communist Party in Parliament. I do not want to detain the House by reading the whole of the report, because it is not relevant to my purpose. But I may invite the attention of the House to one passage. I am quoting it from this paper:

"About Dr. Sinha's allegations in Parliament, Mr. Sundarayya stated that the documents in question were false, fraudulent and forged and the Privileges Committee of Parliament had now almost completed its investigations and Dr. Sinha was finding it difficult to get out of the situation."

I am assuming that this report is a fairly and substantially correct version of what Mr. Sundarayya said in the course of his speech. If my assumption is correct, I have no hesitation in saying that that report is utterly improper and highly objectionable from every point of view. I invite your attention in order that appropriate action may be taken under rule 203 of the Rules of Procedure.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): May I know where Mr. Sundarayya made the statement?

Shri B. Shiva Rao: At Moga, in the Punjab.

Mr. Speaker: The report is there. Hon. Members may refer to the report. I do not think it is Mr. Shiva Rao's contention that the report correctly represents what Mr. Sundarayya said. Any way, *prima facie*, I think, this is a case which should go to the Privileges Committee, and may be considered along with the main question of privilege which they are considering. The Committee will of course, go into the question as to how far the report is correct and, if so, whether it constitutes a breach and,

[Mr. Speaker]

if so, what steps this House should take will also be recommended by the Committee in their report. I think that is enough for the present.

Shri Velayudhan: (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of information, Sir. Are we taking into account anything appearing in the Press?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member's question is entirely irrelevant. It is not anything in the Press that we are taking note of.

Shri Velayudhan: You gave a similar ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The report in the Press distinctly mentions Mr. Sundarayya and it attributes to him certain statements in connection with a matter which is under investigation by the Privileges Committee, and admittedly, the House has not yet received the report of the Privileges Committee. It is therefore necessary, I think, to investigate the facts. Therefore, I said that the Committee will investigate as to whether Mr. Sundarayya did say so as a matter of fact, and if so, it is for the Committee to consider further the circumstances in which he said so and whether his statement constitutes a breach of privilege, and state what the recommendations of the Committee are. The report will be before the House and ultimately the House will decide.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): is not Mr. Sundarayya outside the purview of this House?

Mr. Speaker: No one in the Indian Union is outside the jurisdiction of this House.

Shri S. S. More: As far as this question is concerned?

Mr. Speaker: As far as the privileges are concerned. It is not competent for any person high or low, inside or outside the House, to act or speak in a manner which offends the dignity or interferes with the privileges of this House or any Member of this House. Let there be no misunderstanding or misapprehension that anybody, on the ground that he is not a Member of this House, is entitled to say anything about this House.

Shri S. S. More: Will the Committee go into the question of the responsibility of the *Times of India* people?

Mr. Speaker: That would be for the Committee. I do not want to anticipate that. The Committee will certainly examine whether Mr. Sundarayya said so. Then the *Times of India* comes. It has reported. If the Committee finds that Mr. Sundarayya did not say so, the burden will be heavily upon the *Times of India*.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

INDIAN COUNCIL OF MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that upto the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Indian Council of Medical Research, six nominations were received. Subsequently four Members withdrew their candidature. As the number of the remaining candidates was thus equal to the number of vacancies in the Committee, I declare the following Members to be duly elected:

1. Dr. Satyaban Roy.
2. Dr. S. A. Ebenezer.

RESOLUTION RE LINGUISTIC STATES

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further discussion on the resolution re Linguistic States moved by Shri Tushar Chatterjee on the 7th July, 1952. The time-limit, as hon. Members already know, is 15 minutes. The discussion will include the amendments moved.

शेठ गोबिन्द दास : (मंडला-जबलपुर दक्षिण) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक इस प्रस्ताव के सिद्धान्त का सम्बन्ध है मैं समझता हूं कि इस सिद्धान्त से हम कांग्रेसवादी सभी सहमत हैं। परन्तु यह प्रस्ताव जो यह चाहता है कि इस मामले का निबटारा फ़ौरन किया जाय, मेरा यह विनम्र मत है कि इसका निबटारा वर्तमान परिस्थिति में तत्काल नहीं किया जा सकता।

मैं एक ऐसे प्रदेश से आता हूं जहां दो भाषाएं बोली जाती हैं, एक हिन्दी और दूसरी मराठी और जहां तक भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों के विभाजन का सम्बन्ध

है, मैं उस सारे आन्दोलन से जो कि सन् १९२० से इस सम्बन्ध में किया गया कुछ न कुछ सम्बन्ध रखता हूँ। मैं भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना का बहुत बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूँ और आज भी हूँ। जहाँ तक इस समय के प्रदेशों की रचना है, यह बात स्वीकार करनी होगी कि यह विभाजन हमें अंग्रेजी राज्य की देन है। जिस प्रकार अंग्रेजी भाषा हम पर लादी गयी और उससे पिंड छुड़ाना हमारे लिये एक समस्या बना हुआ है, उसी प्रकार प्रान्तों की वर्तमान रचना का भी हाल है। किसी भी दृष्टि से हम देखें तो हमें यह रचना दोषपूर्ण दिखाई देती है। एक और उत्तर प्रदेश के सदृश विशाल प्रदेश मौजूद हैं और दूसरी तरफ कुर्ग, अजमेर और दिल्ली के प्रदेश हैं। शासन की दृष्टि से, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, हमारी संस्कृति और इतिहास की दृष्टि से किसी भी दृष्टि से वर्तमान विभाजन को जल्दी हो या देर से हमें समाप्त कर नया विभाजन करना होगा और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी मुझे क्षमा करें यदि मैं यह कहूँ कि यह विभाजन केवल किसी एक विशिष्ट प्रान्त का नहीं हो सकता, हमें समूचे भारत-वर्ष को अपने सामने रखकर इस विभाजन पर विचार करना होगा। भाषावार प्रान्तों के विभाजन के विरोध में जो बातें कही जाती हैं, वे मेरी दृष्टि में केवल दो हैं। पहली बात यह है कि इस से प्रान्तीयता बढ़ेगी और झगड़े बढ़ेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ यह गलत है। झगड़े इस समय हैं। भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना से वे समाप्त हो जायेंगे। दूसरी बात यह कही जाती है कि इससे प्रान्तों की संख्या बहुत बढ़ जायेगी और आर्थिक तथा शासन की दृष्टि से इतने अधिक प्रान्तों का संचालन करना बड़ी कठिन बात होगी।

मेरा इस विषय में नम्र निवेदन यह है कि यह भी गलत है और इस के कुछ प्रमाण

मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना से प्रान्तों की संख्या यथार्थ में नहीं बढ़ेगी। केवल तीन प्रदेश इस समय ऐसे हैं जिनमें यह समस्या उठती है, एक मद्रास, दूसरा बम्बई का और तीसरा मध्यप्रदेश। अब इस समय जो मांग भाषावार प्रान्तों के विभाजन की है उसके अनुसार मद्रास के चार प्रान्त बनते हैं एक के स्थान पर, लेकिन यदि आप इस पर थोड़ा ध्यान दें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि अभी भी मद्रास के तीन प्रान्त मौजूद हैं, एक मद्रास, दूसरा ट्रावनकोर कोचीन और तीसरा मैसूर। अब यदि मद्रास प्रान्त के टुकड़े किये जाते हैं तो मद्रास में जहाँ कन्नड़ बोली जाती है वह क्षेत्र मैसूर के साथ जायेगा, जहाँ मलयालम बोली जाती है वह क्षेत्र ट्रावनकोर कोचीन के साथ जायेगा और तामिल और तेलगू के दो प्रान्त होंगे। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि वर्तमान मद्रास के यदि टुकड़े किये गये, तो एक के चार प्रान्त नहीं बनेंगे बल्कि इस समय जो तीन प्रान्त हैं, उनके चार प्रान्त हो जायेंगे। अब हम बम्बई को ले लें। बम्बई में इस समय तीन भाषाएँ बोली जाती हैं, मराठी, गुजराती और कन्नड़। इस समय भी बम्बई के दो प्रान्त हैं, एक बम्बई है और दूसरा सौराष्ट्र। अगर भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हो तो बम्बई में जहाँ कन्नड़ बोली जाती है, वह हिस्सा मैसूर के साथ चला जायेगा सौराष्ट्र और गुजरात एक हो जायेंगे। महाराष्ट्र का हिस्सा मध्यप्रदेश में जहाँ मराठी बोली जाती है उसके साथ हो जायेगा जिस का मतलब यह हुआ कि बम्बई प्रान्त के टुकड़े होने पर वहाँ कोई प्रान्त नहीं बढ़ता। मध्यप्रदेश एक प्रान्त है। यदि भाषावार उसका विभाजन हुआ तो जहाँ मराठी बोली जाती है वह भाग पूना के साथ चला जायेगा और जहाँ हिन्दी बोली जाती

[सेंट गोबिन्द बास]

है, उस भाग को मध्यभारत और विन्ध्य-प्रदेश से मिलाकर और उत्तरप्रदेश के चार जिले झांसी, जालौन, हमीरपुर और बांदा को ले कर एक बृहत्त प्रान्त की रचना हो सकती है। लेकिन यदि उत्तरप्रदेश वाले अपने यह जिले नहीं भी देना चाहते तो हम किसी से जबर्दस्ती नहीं कर सकते। यदि उत्तरप्रदेश वाले अपने जिले नहीं देना चाहते तो भी मध्यप्रदेश के हिन्दी जिले और विन्ध्यप्रदेश तथा मध्यभारत को मिलाकर एक बड़ा प्रान्त बनाया जा सकता है। इस प्रकार यदि हम यथार्थ में देखें तो भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना से भारतवर्ष में केवल एक प्रदेश मद्रास का बढ़ता है, इसके अलावा कहीं और कोई प्रदेश नहीं बढ़ता।

Mr. Speaker: I find that hon. Members are talking amongst themselves and passing remarks. Let us not carry on the discussion in that manner. The hon. Member is entitled to be heard with attention and respect. Whether one agrees with his opinions or not is a different matter.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): We are appreciating his suggestions, Sir.

सेंट गोबिन्द बास : बल्कि कुछ प्रान्त उलट्टे घट जाते हैं जिससे एक फ़ायदा और होता है कि जो इस समय छोटे छोटे प्रान्त हैं और जहाँ पर आर्थिक अड़चनों के कारण उन का पूरा विकास नहीं हो सकता जैसे विन्ध्यप्रदेश सरीखे प्रान्त, उनका भी आर्थिक तथा शासन की दृष्टि से उत्कर्ष किया जा सकता है।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When the hon. Member addresses the House, Members are prompted to interfere. Let him address the Chair.

सेंट गोबिन्द बास : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कुछ और ऐसे छोटे छोटे प्रान्त हैं जो रह नहीं सकेंगे। पेप्सू, हिमाचल प्रदेश और पंजाब कितने छोटे २ प्रान्त हैं, इन प्रान्तों का एकीकरण किया जा सकता है। इसी प्रकार दिल्ली, कुर्ग, अजमेर और भूपाल यह सब अलग कैसे रह सकते हैं, मेरी समझ के बाहर की चीज़ है। जब तक हमें समूचे भारतवर्ष का मानचित्र या नक्शा अपने सामने रख कर न बैठें और इस विषय का कोई न कोई निबटारा न करें, तब तक हमें यह एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न अवश्य दिखता है और जटिल प्रश्न दिखता है, लेकिन यदि हमने इस पर ध्यान दिया तो मेरा यह विश्वास है कि इस विषय को हम निबटा सकते हैं।

अब यदि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना को हम दूसरी दृष्टि से देखें तो भी हमें मानना पड़ेगा कि भाषा का मानव संस्कृति और इतिहास में एक विशिष्ट स्थान है। मानव में और सृष्टि के जो दूसरे प्राणी हैं उन में यदि कोई सब से बड़ा अन्तर है तो वह यह है कि निसर्ग ने मानव को ज्ञान शक्ति दी है जो दूसरों को नहीं दी और उस ज्ञान शक्ति का विकास वह भाषा का आश्रय ले कर, भाषा का आधार ले कर करता है। आज हमारे ऊपर अंग्रेजी भाषा लदी हुई है। पंद्रह वर्ष के भीतर हम अंग्रेजी से पिछ छुड़ाना चाहते हैं। केन्द्र में तो चाहे पंद्रह वर्ष के अन्दर अंग्रेजी से पिछ छूट जाय परन्तु यदि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना न हुई तो मद्रास में आप क्या करेंगे, बम्बई में आप क्या करेंगे। मैं अपने प्रान्त की कठिनाई आप को बतलाता हूँ। हमारे प्रदेश का जो सेक्रेटैरियट है, वहाँ से हम अंग्रेजी को निकालना चाहते हैं लेकिन वहाँ यह प्रश्न

उठता है कि सेन्ट्रेरियट का काम हिन्दी में चले या मराठी में चले। दोनों भाषाओं में तो चल नहीं सकता। इसलिये यह एक ऐसा प्रश्न भी है जिसको हमें अपनी संस्कृति और इतिहास की दृष्टि से और यदि अंगरेजी को पंद्रह वर्षों में हम इस देश से निकालना चाहते हैं तो उस दृष्टि से देखना होगा।

अब यदि आप यह मानते हैं कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना सम्भव नहीं है तो फिर मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि जिस तरह हमने रेलों के सम्बन्ध में किया है उसी तरह हम सारे भारतवर्ष के पांच टुकड़े कर दें, पूर्व, पश्चिम, उत्तर और दक्षिण तथा मध्य भारत। इस तरह से हम इस विषय का निपटारा कर दें इस में भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठेगा और आर्थिक तथा शासन व्यवस्था की दृष्टि से और सभी दृष्टियों से यह पांच टुकड़े इतने बड़े बड़े होंगे कि हम उनका विकास सहज में कर सकेंगे।

जहां तक भाषा का सम्बन्ध है वहां तक जिन प्रान्तों में था एक से अधिक भाषाएं हैं वहां पर हम उन भाषाओं के अलग अलग विश्व विद्यालय स्थापित कर सकते हैं। उन विश्व विद्यालयों में उस भाषा के कालेज, हाई स्कूल और अन्य स्कूल हों। जैसे बम्बई में तीन भाषायें हैं मराठी, कन्नड़ और गुजराती। वहां पर तीन विश्व विद्यालय हों, अभी दो तो हैं, एक मराठी का दूसरा गुजराती का। उन विश्व विद्यालयों के द्वारा उन राज्यों की शिक्षा की व्यवस्था करें और शिक्षा की व्यवस्था कर के जो जिस माध्यम के द्वारा अपनी शिक्षा ग्रहण करना चाहता हो उसको हम उसी माध्यम से शिक्षा दें किसी भी तरह अंगरेजी हमारे ऊपर न लदी रहे इसका पूरा ध्यान रखें

यह विषय जटिल विषय माना जाता है, कुछ दूर तक जटिल है भी। संसार की इस समय की जो परिस्थिति है, हमारे देश की इस समय की परिस्थिति है, हमारी सरकार को जितनी समस्याओं का सामना करना है, यह सब देखते हुए मैं इस विषय पर सरकार के ऊपर कोई जोर नहीं डालना चाहता। मैं मानता हूं कि जो प्रस्ताव इस समय रखा गया है वह इस समय की परिस्थिति के अनुकूल नहीं है। लेकिन इस के साथ साथ जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया, मैं भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूं और आज भी हूं। और मेरा मन है कि आज या कल या परसों जल्दी या देर से हमें इस विषय को निबटाना होगा और जब हम इस विषय को निबटाने के लिये बैठेंगे उस समय केवल एक प्रान्त या एक हिस्से पर विचार न करके सारे देश पर विचार करेंगे। मैं प्रधान मंत्रीजी से कहता हूं कि मैं उन से सहमत नहीं हूं कि हम एक आध स्थान से जहां से इसकी मांग आये उसी को देख लें। मैं तो कहता हूं कि सरकार को सारे भारतवर्ष का मानचित्र ले कर बैठना पड़ेगा और इस सवाल को निपटाना पड़ेगा।

मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन नहीं कर रहा हूं, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का तो विरोध ही कर रहा हूं पर विरोध करते हुए मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह अवश्य कहना चाहता हूं, और सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि आज या कल या कभी न कभी हमें इस विषय को हाथ में लेना चाहिये और जिस प्रकार गोपालस्वामी आग्रगर जी ने रेलवे के मामले को ले कर एक साहसी कदम उठाया है उसी तरह हमें इस मामले में एक साहसी कदम उठाना चाहिये।

Shri A. C. Gaba (Santipur): This is a very delicate question, and I wish this matter would be discussed in the House without any passion or any appeal to sentiments. This question has practically been raised by the Congress and it has now become a problem for the Congress to solve. If it is a ghost that scares the people now, it has been raised by the Congress for years, and now it is for them to lay the ghost. Language can never be totally dissociated from the idea of a State, but it has never been inseparably connected with any nation-state now. We find instances of States containing for centuries people speaking many languages. Switzerland was the best example of that. The German-speaking population would never like to be merged with Germany or Austria, nor would the French or Italian speaking portion like to go to France or to Italy. Similarly, the Flemish-speaking portion of Belgium would not like to go to Holland nor the French-speaking portions of Belgium would like to go to France. Language can cut across the idea of a State or the idea of a nationhood. But when we have been for so many years spreading this theory and saying that States or Provinces should be resettled on the linguistic basis, now we cannot shirk the responsibility of solving this problem. And the dimension this problem has taken and the potential danger that is involved in this question should also not be lost sight of.

Hindi has been taken by this House as the State language for the whole of India. There is no question of any State Government suppressing the spread of Hindi, except at the cost of its own inhabitants. But when it comes to the question of some other language being spoken, in some States then we would expect those States which consist of preponderantly Hindi-speaking people, to show some amount of tolerance and an amount of generosity as also of imagination in dealing with their compatriots speaking some language other than Hindi.

I am here referring particularly to the problem now becoming somewhat bitter, between Bihar and West Bengal. When Bengal was partitioned in 1905 it was a punitive measure against the political consciousness that was growing in Bengal. It was a measure devised to guard against the political influence of the Bengalis, or particularly of the Bangali Hindus. Then, due to the agitation started there and later on taken up by the

Indian National Congress, the British Government had to undo or unsettle what was declared to be the settled fact. Then also they took sufficient care to see that the real implication of the first partition might be maintained. So they put certain portions of the Bengali-speaking area into Bihar. The partition was annulled in 1911. The same year when the Congress met, it passed a resolution moved by no less a person than Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru and supported by Shri Paremeshwar Lal, a Congress leader from Bihar, urging the Government to return those portions, those Bengali-speaking portions, to Bengal. The British Government also made an announcement that the arrangement of boundary then made was only a temporary one and it would later on be rectified. In January 1912, I think, only within two or three weeks of the passing of the resolution in the Congress, some Congress leaders from Bihar, including Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, Shri Deep Narayan Sinha, Shri Paremeshwar Lal, Mr. Mohd. Fakiruddin, Shri Nand Kishore and others, issued a statement in which they said they supported the Congress resolution and said "Such tracts in the Santal Parganas where the prevailing language is Bengali should go to Bengal and the Hindi-speaking tracts of the district should remain in Bihar. As for Chota Nagpur, the whole district of Manbhum and the Pargana Dhalbhum of Singhbhum district were Bengali-speaking and should go to Bengal, the rest of the Division which was Hindi-speaking remaining in Bihar." That was the opinion given by eminent leaders of Bihar in a public statement.

I do not like that this question should be discussed in this House with any passion or any sentiment. But I know certain events happening in these areas are directed to suppress the Bengali language. Bengali is not even taught in some of the primary schools in those areas. I can refer to some eminent Congressmen of Bihar, including Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who, when they used to visit these areas in the course of their Congress work, always used to address public meetings in Bengali. Now the Government of Bihar demands that these are Hindi-speaking areas. I appeal to the Hindi-speaking people that they should show some generosity to the minority elements speaking a language other than Hindi.

I have stated that Hindi is the State language and there can be no question of any State Government taking any step to suppress the development of Hindi except at the cost

of its own inhabitants. In Bengal there are several lakhs of Hindi-speaking people, several lakhs of people coming from Bihar, and I do not think there has been any animosity between the Bengali-speaking people of Calcutta and the Hindi-speaking people there. Last year, when there was something like a near-famine condition in North Bihar, several lakhs of people migrated from those areas to the territory of Bengal and Bengal, in spite of her shortage of food, did not take any step to close the doors. So, I would beg of the Bihar Government and the leaders of Bihar to see that in these areas the Bengali language gets its proper place.

In this connection I would also draw attention to the election results in these areas. In the whole of Chota Nagpur, I think the Congress could not get more than one-third of the seats. I think out of 86 seats, the Congress could get only 26 in the local Assembly. Why is this? This is, I should say, due to what may be called an attitude of insolence on the part of the Hindi-speaking people. Another area where the Congress could not get effective election results is the Santal Parganas, where also the language question is rather difficult. So the Congress and the leaders of Bihar should take cognizance of these things and should be careful about handling the people who are not Hindi-speaking. If the Hindi-speaking people take up an attitude of insolence, it will rather be detrimental to the interests of Hindi.

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the hon. Member that the chief point of the debate is not Hindi vs. other languages. The question is the desirability or otherwise of linguistic provinces.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): On that the hon. Member has already given an opinion.

Mr. Speaker: It is wrong on the part of the hon. Member to carry on a discussion like that.

Shri A. C. Guha: My submission was that this question has taken different shapes in different areas. In Bihar this question has taken the shape of conflict between different languages.

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt? While he was talking of Bihar and the position of the Bengali-speaking population of Bihar, I thought that he was making an argument about the undesirability of not having linguistic provinces. But now he goes further and crosses the carrier and puts the question of Hindi vs. other languages. That is the distinction.

Shri A. C. Guha: I would say that there is a potential danger to our national solidarity in this question of linguistic provinces. Just a few minutes ago when my predecessor, Seth Govind Das was referring to certain areas of the United Provinces being taken over and tagged on to certain areas of C. P. to be formed into another province, there were protests from the Hindi friends. We have known of some cases in other countries also where Arabic is the common language and so many Arab States are fighting amongst themselves. Even if you try to put all the States on a linguistic basis, I do not think the Hindi-speaking population will agree to such a proposal. Then the Hindi-speaking States would number, I think, not less than five or six. I do not think they would agree to have one or even two Hindi-speaking States in the whole of India to absorb all the Hindi-speaking population. So it is not a practical proposal now to put all the States on a linguistic basis. Then how to solve this problem? We must find out some way to solve it. I would say that the Government should devise some means to put the provinces on some economic and administrative basis and also, I may say, on a topographical basis.

I may also refer here to a proposal which was first mooted by the Cabinet Mission on the 16th June 1946. That proposal was to have some zone or groups. My friend, Seth Govind Das, was also referring to something like that. I do not know if the Government can try to revive that proposal and if they will have groups instead of so many States. Though we have been supporting this proposal of having linguistic provinces, in view of the practical difficulties in grappling with this problem, it will not be a practical proposal at the present moment at least. If some day a Boundary Commission is set up—and I think it should be set up in some near future—then that Boundary Commission should be given the task of considering if instead of having so many linguistic States there may be some groups—within the groups there may be something like a small federation or federating units. That will be, I think, a more practical solution of the whole question.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): This resolution has my theoretical support. But from a practical point of view, I think the resolution, if it is accepted, cannot be implemented immediately. And the grounds are very serious. So far as the desirability of it is concerned, that was accepted long

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

long ago and I agree that at some time or other this country must be divided on a linguistic basis. The majority of the States in this country are already on a linguistic basis though, no doubt, here and there some small adjustments have to be made with regard to boundaries. Assam is a linguistic area. West Bengal is a linguistic area. Bihar is a linguistic area, the whole of Uttar Pradesh has one language, in Rajasthan there is one language, and in the Punjab they have got their own language, and so far as Orissa is concerned Oriya is the prevailing language. Therefore, so far as these States are concerned they are already on a linguistic basis. But a small difference in adjustment has to be made in the South and in Bombay. Bombay consists of Maharashtra, Karnataka and Gujarat. I do not know if Gujarat can be joined with Saurashtra—Gujarat and Saurashtra can go together and they can have a Maha Saurashtra or Maha Gujarat. Even otherwise it will add only one more State to the total number of States. Today the only States to be interfered with in that manner and split up are Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Madras. There are already so many States in existence and if only we add two more to the total number we will have the whole of India divided on a linguistic basis. Let us not be under the impression that we are going to add a number of States and divide the country into a number of *chhota* States and bring our country to the same position as existed long ago—Anga, Vanga, Kalinga, Vidharbha, etc.—there were fifty odd States long ago. But even if there should be re-adjustment on a linguistic basis we may not be adding more than one or two, at the most three new States in our country. Take, for instance, Bombay. The portion of Karnataka may be tacked on to Mysore and Coorg to form a homogeneous Karnataka State in which case Mysore being already a State we will not be adding to the total number of States. So far as Maharashtra is concerned it will be a new State. I hope they will give up Maha Vidharbha for some time—I hope Maha Vidharbha will go with Maharashtra because the language is common. My friend, Dr. Deshmukh is under the impression that he has got the right immediately to split it up—let him not be under that impression. The solution of the problem of the rest of Madhya Pradesh means mixing water with water—for instance, Bundelkhand goes with Uttar Pradesh. But my difficulty is this: It appears easy to us to sit and divide the country on a linguistic basis, but look at the

differences between brother and brother, between one Hindi-speaking area and another Hindi-speaking area and the trouble that might come out of it. I had supported my friend, Seth Govind Das when he said that a portion of Uttar Pradesh may be added on to the northern portion of Maha Koshal so as to form an equally big Hindi-speaking State like Uttar Pradesh.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : May I interrupt, Sir ? मुझे इस बात में भी कोई आपत्ति नहीं कि हमारे महाकोशल के सब जिले उत्तरप्रदेश में मिला लिये जायं, वह बड़ भाई हैं, उन्हें ज्यादा मिल जाय उसमें कोई हर्ज नहीं है ।

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: We from the South are afraid. If the whole Maha Koshal will join Uttar Pradesh then Uttar Pradesh will become such a big State that all of us will be overshadowed by it. Even though it may be one linguistic State, we are terribly afraid of a linguistic State bulging out so big and overshadowing the other *Chhota* States in the South.

In respect of Kerala there is only one district, Malabar, which is in the Madras State and it can easily be joined to Travancore-Cochin and made part of a homogeneous State.

10 A.M.

Now I come to Andhra. The claim of Andhra stands on a different footing altogether from the rest. Formerly Orissa was separated on the one side from Bihar and on the other side from Andhra, but still Koraput and some area on the border which is claimed to be Telugu and where the majority of the people are Telugu-speaking, have been tacked on to Orissa. So this trouble is still going on. Take, for instance, the border between Bihar and Bengal. I agree with the demand of Bengalis that that portion of Bihar towards the east must go to Bengal, it is a legitimate claim. If in a large chunk of territory the people speaking a particular language want to have their own administration, what is the meaning of their imposing their will against a small linguistic minority and insisting on their continuing there notwithstanding the fact that they speak a different language altogether? It is inconsistent. Therefore, let us be true to our professions. If we want to divide the areas

on a linguistic basis let those small chunks of territory adjoining the border which have an altogether different language be separated, let us not try to grab them and enforce our will upon them merely because that territory is necessary to make our territory big. That is the consideration both with respect to Orissa and Andhra on the one hand and West Bengal and Bihar on the other.

I shudder to think of the many problems that we may have to face in the solution of this question. Difficulties will arise if immediately we undertake the splitting of this country into linguistic areas. I know some time ago there was a desire on the part of Kerala people from Malabar for an Aikya Kerala, a United Kerala. Travancore was independent and so was Cochin even though with much smaller resources, but now when once they have been joined together eternal differences, almost to the extent of fighting each other and leading to a rebellion, are developing between Cochin and Travancore. They say Cochin is not properly represented, that Cochin is facing a lot of difficulties. I have tried to study the problem. Cochin was an independent State, they had their own problems, they had their own Ministers, and so on. But sufficient representation is not given to them in the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and therefore trouble is brewing there.

Likewise, my fear is that if we start today on this linguistic division there will be enormous trouble brewing. Therefore, what I suggest is that you must allow this idea to go round with respect to all the other States in the country, and allow it to percolate in people's minds. This is one of the steps that we have taken in this regard. There is so much support for the resolution. On the other side, whoever opposes it does not oppose it on the principle that division on a linguistic basis is not proper or desirable. But we have to consider the conditions that are obtaining in the country today. We are trying to consolidate the whole country into a nation; after its division on a religious basis if we divide it on a linguistic basis—is this the proper time for that? On our border there are so many problems. The international situation is also not so clear; one week it appears as if the war clouds have disappeared, another week it appears as if they have gathered again. If a conflict should arise, should we be going on struggling against smaller things like this, putting one district here and one there and dividing the country on a linguistic basis? That way many more troubles may be created. Therefore, I appeal to the hon. Members who have tabled

this resolution to consider these factors. At present it is unlike the British regime when we used to pass resolutions which may be accepted or may not be accepted. If today this resolution is passed by a democratic Parliament like this it will have to be accepted by the Government. If it is passed they must either accept it and implement it or else they must go out of office. Therefore, the hon. Member who has tabled this resolution will kindly think it over and also kindly consider whether the time is propitious for this business of linguistic division. Actually it may come to pass much sooner than we expect. While many of our older people live we may have the country divided on this basis and set at rest many of the difficult problems. I have absolute sympathy for the Telugus in Orissa and for the Bengalis in Bihar. It is a matter which must be adjusted some day, but today the time is not propitious for it.

Let me say a few words on Andhra lest I should be misunderstood as not being in sympathy with the Andhras. I presided over an Andhra Mahasabha so early as 1938 and demanded the formation of a separate Andhra Province. [The Andhra Province can be easily formed. In a joint Hindu family, brothers live together in amity and without difficulty and do not want to separate from one another until their wives begin to quarrel. And remember that day when the pot is placed on the hearth, the rice is half-cooked, the younger brother will come and break the pot. That is the position as between the Andhras and Tamilians in South India today. The elder brother breaks the pot, I agree; not the younger brother.]

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): The trouble has been created by the wives.

Mr Speaker: I think this practice of talking and taking the whole debate so lightly as though we were staging something by way of a drama or some theatrical performance is really deprecable. I feel so much disappointed and depressed that the House should take the very serious things that are being discussed, in such a light mood as that.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Kanpur Distt.—South cum Etawah Distt.—East): When brothers' wives are introduced naturally the debate becomes lighthearted.

Mr. Speaker: Let us consider these matters seriously or stop this debate and waste of time. Every Member is entitled to be heard with respect. Whether we agree with his opinion or not is immaterial. He is giving his own ideas, his own opinions and his

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

own facts. Let them be considered coolly. Here is a very important problem, as can be seen from the speeches delivered here and the agitation that is going on in the country. Let us not deal with it lightly in the manner in which we are doing at present.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: This agitation for an Andhra Province is nearly forty years old. The Andhra Province, if it is carved out, will be an economic unit, even apart from having Vishal Andhra by taking a portion of Hyderabad and attaching it to Andhra Province. This has been conceded on various platforms by the Congress, and the Madras Legislative Council also passed resolutions many a time and the Andhra Province was on the point of coming to fruition two years ago. It broke down on the question whether Madras city should form part of Andhra or whether it should be broken up into two parts, one part going to Tamil Nad and another part going to Andhra. The other alternative was to convert Madras city into a separate Chief Commissioner's Province. We, the Andhra Members in Parliament, agreed that we need not worry ourselves with Madras city for the time being. It might be carved out of the Madras State, which is a composite province consisting of Andhra portions, Kerala portions and Kannada portions and Tamil Nad. We said, let that composite province remain and from it, the Andhra districts may be taken out and converted into an Andhra Province. Unfortunately, some friends fasted and their fast did not help the matter but disturbed the situation here. Some other friends went to Madras and said, "Madras city is ours; Madras city is ours." Some Andhra gentlemen went about the streets of Madras saying that Madras city is theirs. Tamilians' voices are not wanting which will cry more hoarsely that Madras city is theirs exclusively. That is the difficulty. We wanted to go into this matter and get the province as early as possible, and take the question of Madras city later. Madras will not go anywhere. Will it disappear into the Bay of Bengal? If the Andhra province is formed, we shall be in a better position then with our own Governor, with our own Ministers, to put pressure upon the Central Government and say that a portion of Madras should come to us, or that Madras city should be formed into a separate Chief Commissioner's Province. But our friends there had no patience.

In the interval, the districts of Rayalaseema were affected by famine. For the last four or five years, famine has been raging there. It has become notori-

ous. The people there have become a little agitated over this matter. Therefore, they do not want a separation of the Madras Province, because if the Andhra Province is formed it will become a very small unit and the Rayalaseemites fear that sufficient money for the development of Rayalaseema may not become available. Further, Madras city is so near Rayalaseema and if Madras city does not become the capital of the new Andhra Province they will have to travel a distance of 200 or 300 miles from one extreme corner to Bezwada, from Anantpur etc. There are influential opinions here and there against the immediate formation of Andhra Province, although I do not say that the Rayalaseemites will not ultimately agree. This matter has to be settled not by one man undertaking a fast. This matter has to be settled amicably. Even Rajaji the other day said that he is not against an Andhra Province. The Prime Minister has stated that Andhra Province stands on a different footing for the reason that this agitation has been going on for a longer time. Let us the Andhra Members here and outside—put our heads together and try to evolve an agreed formula, and not insist upon Madras city coming into the Andhra Province immediately. Let us not ask that the whole of Madras city should become part and parcel of Andhra Province. It can never become. So if Madras is partly Andhra and partly Tamilian, it would be better, or it may be converted into a Chief Commissioner's Province, or the third alternative is that it may be relegated to South India or Tamil Nad. Dr. Lanka Sundram does not accept the third proposition. (Dr. Lanka Sundram: Yes.) Then let us explore the possibility of the other two alternatives. If that is done, I am sure the Prime Minister will pay heed to our request and form the Andhra Province apart from the general question of carving out linguistic States.

The present resolution is in general terms and I am sorry I shall not be able to agree to it being passed.

Mr. Speaker: Shri B. Mahata.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): We have moved some amendments. Shall we be given a chance?

Mr. Speaker: Did they not get a chance last time?

Shri S. S. More: No.

Mr. Speaker: They will be given a chance, but not necessarily everyone.

Shri S. S. More: The persons who have moved amendments are very few.

and if priority is to be given, it should be given to us.

Mr. Speaker: If I give an undertaking that everyone who moves an amendment will get a chance to speak, I shall be getting amendments galore. I shall look at the representative character of the speakers and I shall give a chance to people from different provinces—representative persons—to have their say. I called upon this particular gentleman, firstly, because he is not conversant with English at all and, secondly, because he comes from an area which is as good as a tribal area. Let us hear what various people have to say on this question.

श्री बी० महाता (मानभूम दक्षिण व धालभूम): माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं तो मानभूम वासी हूँ और मेरी भाषा बंगला है। मैं अंगरेजी जानता नहीं हूँ इसलिये जो कुछ यहां होता है वह मैं नहीं समझता। जेल के अन्दर मेने थोड़ी बहुत हिन्दी सीखी है और इस के बाद भी कोशिश कर रहा था लेकिन वहां पर कुछ हिन्दी प्रेमी लोए हैं जो हमारी भाषा को दबाने के लिये जबर्दस्ती कर रहे हैं। इस लिये मैं हिन्दी से घबरा गया हूँ और मेरे हिन्दी सीखने में बड़ी मुश्किल हो गई है। लेकिन चूँकि यह हमारी राज्य भाषा रखी गई है इस लिये मैं टूटी फूटी हिन्दी में अपनी बात कहने की कोशिश करूंगा। अगर गलती हो तो आप क्षमा करेंगे।

बात यह है कि मैं मानभूम का बाशिन्दा तो हूँ ही इस लिये मानभूम के विषय में भाषा के उपर विभाजन का प्रश्न बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है। मानभूम में भाषा के बारे में बड़ा दमन चल रहा है इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस के बारे में कोई फैसला हो जाये तो समूची जनता को जो तकलीफ़ में है बहुत शान्ति मिले।

मने पहले कहा है कि हिन्दी भाषा को हमारी बंगला भाषा पर लादा जा रहा है। मैं जहां जहां जाता हूँ और जहां जहां

इस प्रश्न पर बात होती है देखता हूँ कि भाषा के बारे में लोग कहते हैं कि यह बहुत विभेद (वैषम्यता) की बात है यह प्रादेशिकता (प्रांतीयता) की बात है। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रादेशिकता वाद है। मैं कांग्रेस में काम करता था। हमारे जिले में कांग्रेस के कार्यकर्ता और हमारे पूज्य नेता अतुल बाबू जिनको यहां के बहुत से मेम्बर जानते होंगे उनकी शिक्षा में हज़ारों आदमी एक झुंड में मिल कर काम कर रहे हैं। भाषा के बारे में कांग्रेस का जो प्रस्ताव है उसको देखते हुए — और गांधीजी की जो शिक्षा है उस पर विचार कर के देश के शासन की सुविधा के लिये यह बात में जरूर अनुभव करता हूँ कि भाषावार प्रान्त जरूरी हैं। लेकिन इस तरह का विचार रखते हुए भी मेने इस प्रश्न को नहीं उठाया। क्योंकि हम देखें कि यह भाषावार विभाजन का जो प्रश्न है यह हमारे आल इंडिया का भारतवर्ष के नेतृ वर्ग का है और वही इसको तय करेंगे। यदि यह नहीं तय होगा—इसके बारे में कोई फैसला नहीं होगा तो हम देखते हैं कि जनता में हर एक जो प्राविन्शल सीमायें हैं वहां के लोगों में विप्लव हो जाने की सम्भावना है।

इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर इस काम को जल्दी से जल्दी किया जायगा तो जो इतना बड़ा विप्लव होने वाला है वह नहीं होगा। लोग हमसे कहते हैं कि हम प्रादेशिकता करते हैं। परन्तु उनको स्वयं प्रादेशिकता करने का मौका मिल गया है और वह प्रादेशिकता कर रहे हैं। वह लोग किसी न किसी प्रकार हमको अपने राज्य में रखने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं और हम से कहते हैं कि हम प्रादेशिकता करते हैं।

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

हम देखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान में जो दूसरी भाषा बोलने वाले हिन्दू हैं उनके साथ मैजा-

[श्री बी० महाता]

रिटी वाले बुरा व्यवहार करते हैं और उनको सताते हैं। ऐसा ही बरताव इस देश में उन राज्यों में उन लोगों के साथ किया जाता है जो कि उस राज्य के किसी अंचल में रहते हैं। पर दूसरी भाषा बोलते हैं। आप हमारे मानभूम को ही ले लीजिये। जब कांग्रेस हाई कमांड की देहरादून में मीटिंग हुई थी तो हमारे नेताओं ने उन को बताया था कि मानभूम में बिहार सरकार कैसा काम कर रही है। लेकिन वह देखते हैं पर कुछ करते नहीं हैं। इसलिये होत यही है कि जिस तरह पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं को सताया जाता है उसी तरह हमको भी सताया जाता रहेगा। और जब तक इसका फ़ैसला नहीं होगा यही हाल रहेगा। यहां के लोगों को जो कष्ट हो रहा है उसको आपको देखना होगा।

हिन्दुस्तान में और पाकिस्तान में जो झगड़ा है उसके लिये संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ कहता है कि आपसमें मिल कर फ़ैसला कर लिया जाय। पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि नहीं काश्मीर का फ़ैसला तो काश्मीर के लोग ही करेंगे। इसी तरह कहा जाता है कि बंगाल और बिहार मिल कर इस झगड़े को तै कर लें। पर वह तो वादी और प्रतिवादी हैं और वह आपस में मिल कर बैसे ही फ़ैसला नहीं कर सकते जैसे कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान नहीं कर सकते हैं। वह झगड़ा तो काश्मीर के लोग ही तै कर सकते हैं। यही मैं भी कहता हूं कि मानभूम का झगड़ा वहां वाले ही कर सकते हैं और बंगाल और बिहार वाले नहीं कर सकते हमारे नेताओं ने भी यह फ़ैसला वहां की जनता पर ही छोड़ दिया है। यही बात हम सब से कहते हैं। हमारा यही कहना है कि जब तक इस झगड़ा फ़ैसला नहीं होता

है हमको किसी बाहर की जगह में जाने को कहा जाय तो हम जाने को तैयार हैं क्योंकि बिहार सरकार ने हमको इतना सताया है कि हमारा वहां रहना मुश्किल हो गया है। इसलिये मैं आपसे यही निवेदन करता हूं कि जब तक आप इसका फ़ैसला न करें आप हम को किसी दूसरी जगह रहने की इजाजत दे दें। मुझे यही कहना है।

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I am really surprised to find that after thirty years of doing propaganda, passing resolutions in the Working Committee and putting the promise before the people in 1946 as well as in 1951, today we should be discussing the question of linguistic provinces and redistribution of the States on a linguistic basis. But I am happy to find that as far as the principle is concerned there is nobody, except one or two, who objects to it. As far as the practical implementation of it is concerned, the difficulties are pointed out. I can understand the difficulties, because not only with regard to the question of linguistic provinces but with regard to all the other questions in respect of which promises have been made, the practical difficulty is placed before the people when they agitate for implementation of those promises.

But the most important thing about this matter is this. The other day the Prime Minister made a speech on the floor of this House which surprised me. In the course of his speech in one place the Prime Minister said: "In fact I have never been very anxious about linguistic provinces. I have peculiar views about it". This is the first time we hear that the Prime Minister, who had been the head of the Congress, had a peculiar view about linguistic provinces and that he was not anxious about linguistic provinces.

In 1946 wherever the Congress contested any of the seats this was the election manifesto which it placed before the people of this country. It not only very clearly speaks about linguistic provinces but also says that the matter would be implemented very soon. In the election manifesto of 1946, it is stated:

"It has stood for full opportunities for the people as a whole to grow and develop according to

their own wishes and genius. It has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger framework and it has stated that for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted, as far as possible on a linguistic and cultural basis".

Not only that. Further in the manifesto it is stated:

"The federation of India must be a willing union of its various parts. In order to give the maximum of freedom to the constituent units there may be a minimum list of common and essential federal subjects which will apply to all units, and a further optional list of common subjects which may be accepted by such units as desire to do so."

So, it is not only a question of the redistribution of the provinces on a linguistic basis; also the subjects which may be accepted have been stated there. I can understand the practical difficulties and about the slogan of practical difficulties even in 1946.

If in the election manifesto of 1951, they had clearly stated that they accepted the principle of linguistic provinces, but there were difficulties and so we would have to wait for a long time, I can certainly understand that. But, they have stated in the election manifesto:

"A demand for a re-distribution, of provinces on a linguistic basis has been persistently made in the south and west of India. The Congress expressed itself in favour of linguistic provinces many years ago. A decision on this question ultimately depends upon the wishes of the people concerned. While linguistic reasons have undoubtedly a certain cultural and other importance, there are other factors such as economic, administrative and financial which have to be taken into consideration. Where such a demand represents the agreed views of the people concerned, the necessary steps prescribed by the Constitution including the appointment of a Boundary Commission, should be taken."

Therefore, when our Prime Minister says that he had never been very anxious about linguistic provinces and that he had peculiar views about it; certainly, that is a new thing that we learn today. What we thought and what the country thought was that one in-

dividual however great he may be may not be very anxious about linguistic provinces, but the Congress Committee was there and the Congress Committee had passed resolutions and had placed before the people in 1946 and also in 1951 that certain practical steps would be taken for the implementation of these things. Now, it is said that it is not the anxiety of one individual, however much he may differ from this decision, to implement the promises that had been given to the people at the time of the elections both in 1946 and 1951, and also to respect the resolutions of the Congress Working Committee passed so many years ago. I not only find that there is a promise that they agree on the principle of re-distribution of States on a linguistic basis but I find that there is a going back even on that principle. They have today said that we do not agree with the principle of linguistic provinces. It had been put on record; it had been passed by the Working Committee; it had been put before the people. They say that there are practical difficulties.

Going into the practical difficulties, the Prime Minister says:

"I have been over-burdened by the thought that in these critical days or years we must give top-most priority to developing a sense of unity in India and that anything that might come in the way of that unity might perhaps be delayed a little. But we have laid that strong foundation—because of that I frankly say that I have not taken any steps."

The resolution is very clear. It has been said that it is not for the division of India. It is not for the balkanisation of India. The resolution says: "immediate steps should be taken to redistribute the States on a linguistic basis and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly". How does this go against the unity of India? What are the practical difficulties today? I do not know. Only if we shut our eyes, we can say we are all one. The division of India into so many multilingual States is not of our making. It has been there because the imperialist rulers wanted it to be like that. Theirs was the policy of 'divide and rule' and it helped them. Today, the question before us is, is there unity? Do you feel that there is unity? Does this division of India on the basis that we have today, help towards the unity of India? Certainly not. Cochin and Travancore are

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

there. If some portions of Malabar are added to them, it does not lead to the disunity of India; only it adds to the feeling of unity. Let us take ourselves. Is there a feeling of unity? Certainly everybody has a feeling of nationalism. When a Bengalee sees another Bengalee he speaks to him in Bengali. So does a Maharatta, Punjabi or Tamilian. There is a feeling of nationalism. There is this reality. When a Tamilian speaks to another in Tamil, he has the same feeling and he feels that he can speak in the same language to everybody in that area. He feels that they are all together. That is the instinct of man. That feeling of unity is there; that reality is there. When that reality is there, what is it they are trying to put forward?

There is already division in the country created by the British power. I have no time; I do not want to quote. It is stated in the resolution passed in the Jaipur Congress that this division was created by the British power and it is for that reason that we have to take up this question. The report says:

"The Congress approval of this principle was partly due to the artificial manner in which existing provinces had been created by the British power in India. It was chiefly due to a desire to have, as far as possible, homogeneous cultural units which would presumably advance more rapidly because of this homogeneity."

So, in 1946 it was clearly stated that the British power in India had created these provinces, that there is no homogeneity, and that homogeneity will grow with the unity of the people. That is the reason why we said that there should be a redistribution of the States on a linguistic basis, what is the reality today? We understand that in the agitation for Aikya Kerala, Visal Andhra and some other States, there is a feeling among the people that they must be together. Every one feels that he is only a Punjabi, Bengalee or Tamilian or Andhra etc. He does not feel that he is an Indian. He does not feel that he is a part of India and that the security and economic prosperity of India depends upon their unity, the unity of all of them as Indians. If that feeling is not there, we understand that that is not unity. But, today, if the people of Malabar or the people in one portion of Telangana join with the other people, that does not make them think that we

have nothing to do with the other portions of India, and we do not care for other people who speak other languages. If that feeling is there, they can no longer be considered as Indians. The one thing that the British did for us was that they made us feel united. There was foreign exploitation; we were all exploited; Punjabis, Madrasis, Bengalees. We were all treated as slaves. Then, we said, we are Indians. We are all together, we do not belong to this part or that of the country, we are together, we are against you. It was that unity that made us fight together. In the same way, today, I see a strong desire among the people to see that all those who have been cut up by the British people in India should come together, and then work for the development of their culture and other things, not thinking that they belong to a particular portion, but to all India. The Congress Working Committee has recognised this and it is specifically stated in the resolution passed in 1946—I have no time to quote—that the only way in which we reach the people is by talking to the people in their own language. So, even in the case of the Five Year Plan, if we cannot speak to the people in their own language, certainly, you cannot induce the people, you cannot enthuse the people. For inspiring the people, for enthusing the people, for making the people understand that they are a part of India, and that a development of the country as a whole must be there, distribution of the States on a linguistic basis is very necessary.

The second point that I want to deal with is this. The Prime Minister said:

"Another aspect which is equally important is that we have certain very important languages in India. A language by itself may be good or bad but round that language clusters of ways of living, sometimes ways of thought and all kinds of ways have grown and it is but right that that particular aspect of cultural manifestation should have an opportunity for full growth."

This is a very important thing which the Prime Minister has said: "May I say that I think that it would be undesirable, unfortunate and injurious for Hyderabad to be disintegrated". I would only say that it is undesirable, unfortunate and injurious not for the people of Hyderabad, but for the Nizam of Hyderabad. It would be undesirable, unfortunate and injurious for the Jagir-

dars and Deshmukhs in Hyderabad, because they do not want it. As far as the people of Hyderabad are concerned, whether they speak Telugu, Canarese or Marathi, if you ask them whether the disintegration of Hyderabad will be injurious to them, unfortunate for them, I am sure, certainly they will say "no". Let the hon. Prime Minister take a plebiscite on this issue, whether the disintegration of Hyderabad would be injurious, unfortunate and undesirable to the people of Hyderabad. I am sure the verdict will be against what the Prime Minister has said.

The most important point is that the Prime Minister has said: "May I say that any attempt at splitting up Hyderabad would upset the whole structure of South India?" That was a surprise to me that it will be upsetting the whole of South India. It may upset the present Government, it may upset the Nizam and it may upset other people there, but how will it upset the whole of South India? Taking the results of the last elections, I say it will upset the present Government. Take Kerala, and the Members elected to the Assembly from Malabar. Malabar has 30 seats, out of which four went to the Congress and 26 against the Congress. Taking Kerala as a whole, if Kerala is constituted as a province and there is an Assembly, it may upset the present Government, and it may have a non-Congress Government. If that is what the Prime Minister meant, it is true; it may upset the present structure of South India, it may upset the Governments of South India either in Kerala or in Tamil Nad or in Andhra. It may not upset anything else.

It is said that there are difficulties, but has not the Government solved problems which have been difficult? Did we not solve the problem of the abolition of Zamindari? Not only that, there are other problems today. There is a division in the country as to whether the people want the Congress Government or not. There are so many who are against it. That problem has to be solved for the reason that there is a division in the country. Let us not fight each other. We are not doing it. Whenever there is a difference we fight the elections. That does not mean there is disunity. We fought the elections and got the verdict from the people. So, today what really should be done is that a Boundary Commission should be set up, a conference should be called and we should try to arrive at a satisfactory settlement. If by that also nothing can be done, the only way in which

the problem is to be solved, is to put the problem before the people, saying, "The leaders of the different parties of the country are not able to come to an agreement. We put it before you. We want to solve the problem by ascertaining your wish". That is the only way in which this can be done.

It is said if we tackle the problem, there will be disunity in the country. I say you are allowing that disunity to develop. You yourself said, Sir, about some pots being broken. So many pots will be broken. There are Andhras, Tamilians and others fighting against each other. You have admitted that. Everybody has admitted that. Do you want them to continue the struggle, to continue the fight? You may not care for Swami Sitaram going on fast. You said there are younger men of 35 years prepared to go on fast. Everybody will go on fast. Are you not allowing the people to develop disunity and carry on the struggle against each other? Either you will have to ask the hon. Home Minister to introduce another Bill to form the linguistic provinces, or you will have to see that there is today an agitation. In the south in some parts they are asking not only for linguistic provinces, they are asking for division of India. It is due to the slackness, the carelessness, the way in which the question of the linguistic provinces has been dealt with by the Government, that a feeling is developing in the country today, whether you like it or not, that it must be divided, that some parts have nothing to do with the other parts of India. Do you want such things to develop in the country? Today there is an agitation, a quarrel going on. If you want to solve the problem, you will have to find out the wishes of the people. It may go against the unity of India, the security of India, it may go against everything which the whole people of India want. My opinion is that if the Government does not today tackle the situation and do something immediately in order to solve the problem—wherever the problems cannot be solved, let them put it before the people, let the people decide. If the people of Madras want that it must be a part of Tamilnad or Andhra, if the majority of the people want it, let it be so. That is the only way in which you can solve the problem where there is difficulty. But what the Prime Minister said, his whole speech, has gone against it. There has only been lip sympathy saying that we approve of the formation of these linguistic provinces, but

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

nothing has been done." Not only that. The Prime Minister has said: "I was not anxious about it. I do not want it, but the Congress wants it. There are difficulties." There are always difficulties for any Government in any country. There will be difficulties. If you go on like this, it will never be solved. It is the people who can solve the difficulties. We have to put it before the people.

I support the resolution and I say, as far as Hyderabad or any province is concerned, if the Government is not going to implement their promise, then, certainly, as one of the hon. Members said, the people will not wait. When the Britishers were here, they said "There is Hindu-Muslim disunity in the country. India can never be independent. When we give freedom and go away, there will be fight between the Hindus and Muslims", but the people of India fought and got freedom. So, today, if the linguistic provinces are not formed, then certainly, the people of Hyderabad or the other parts of the country, whether it is Punjab, Bengal or any other place where there is a demand that there must be a re-distribution of the States, they are going to fight and the Government will find within the next six months that instead of promising the people to take action, they will have to pass some Bill or resolution by which the agitation of the people can be crushed either by the air force or navy or some other force. This cannot be solved by the way in which the Prime Minister has spoken about it, and I hope that the Government will see that this is a problem in which the people, whatever may be their difference, unite irrespective of party or any other consideration. I hope this will be taken note of by Government, and some immediate steps will be taken. I strongly support the resolution.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): The demand for linguistic provinces is becoming more and more insistent. The Government cannot ignore this fact, nor is it desirable to put off this question for ever. The suspense is annoying.

As one who has had something to do with popularising the idea of a Kerala Province, I wish to have my say. A convention was held in Trichur. It was inaugurated by the Maharaja of Cochin. The Chairman of the Reception Committee was the retired Chief Justice of Cochin, and I presided over that conference. People like the High Commissioner of India in Britain, Sri Krishna Menon,

and several others were present. There, a resolution was passed demanding the formation of a Kerala Province. After two years when another convention was held with the idea of adding on Malabar also to the Travancore-Cochin State, and forming a Kerala Province, that was voted down. The Kerala Province is really not a linguistic one. The idea of Kerala is as old as history. If you ask any school-boy in Travancore or Malabar, he will tell you that the Kerala province extends from Kanya Kumari to Gokarnam and from Sahyadri on the East to the Arabian Sea on the West. It includes in the South the Tamil speaking taluks of Travancore-Cochin and on the North, the Tulu and Kannada speaking areas of South Kanara, and in the middle the Malayalam speaking area.

Nobody questions the desirability of a re-division of the provinces as they exist today. A friend suggested the other day that with a foot-rule and pencil as they did in America, you can divide the provinces here. I do not mind it. With a good map of India and all the necessary statistics at your disposal, if you divide India into a number of smaller provinces, certainly it will be welcome. The Leader of the House also said the other day that the formation of small provinces would be desirable in the interest of better administration. Then he referred also to the Uttar Pradesh which sprawls across the continent of India like a leviathan. Its population is about 632 lakhs, more than double that of several other provinces in India. There is no reason why it should remain as one single province. Probably if it is divided into two or more provinces, that would add to the administrative convenience. There is no doubt about that.

But you will do well to understand the problem that faces us who want a Kerala province. The density of population of Travancore is about 1015 per square mile, while that of Malabar is 992. If these two are formed into a province the density will probably be a 1000 per square mile. In the last three or four years, there was an exodus of people from Travancore to Malabar. They are very good cultivators. As they had no lands in Travancore they went in search of land to Malabar. Some two lakhs of them came.

I am afraid the advocates of these linguistic provinces also are becoming perhaps as fanatic as the communalists. Any good idea may be stretched to an absurdity. Now the Andhras and the Tamils claim Madras

for their provinces. The reason for it is that both of them have contributed to make Madras what it is. And both of them want to divide Madras, so that their capital may be located there. A similar claim was made by one who advocated a Kerala province; he wanted a portion of Madras to go to Kerala also. And not only that, he wanted also a corridor from Madras to Malabar, about 300 miles in length along the railway line from Madras to Mangalore. It is a fantastic idea.

Similarly the Karnataka province people claim Wyanad, a taluk in Malabar, which produces tea, coffee, pepper, cardamom, oranges and so on. Perhaps their claim is based on the fact that years ago, some Gowndens from Mysore migrated to Malabar. It may be even now they have not forgotten their Kanarese, although they all talk Malayalam. I find that the Tamils also are laying claim to a part of Travancore, where Tamil is spoken. They also claim Peremudu and Devikulam which are plantation areas. The owners of these plantations are either Travancoreans or Europeans. They recruited labour from the other side of the Western Ghats, probably because labour was cheap there. On that score, they claim these two areas also. If a linguistic province is formed, with Malabar, Cochin and Travancore, it is sure to be a deficit province, with several of its problems unsolved and incapable of solution. We shall always have to depend upon doles or loans or subsidies from the Centre. We do not want a province like that. If, however, a province is formed on the West Coast consisting of Travancore-Cochin, Malabar, South Kanara, Coorg, and the Nilgiris, that will be a self-sufficient compact area, the whole of it lying between the Western Ghats and the sea. So, it is not on the basis of language that I claim this province. That land is also known as Parasurama Kshetra. The story is, this land was colonised by Parasurama, and it was reclaimed with people from the other side of the Ghats. It is a geological fact that at one time, the sea washed the foot of the Western Ghats, and probably as a result of some upheaval of nature, the sea receded leaving the land known as Malabar. It is a compact area, which has similar physical features, and the same products more or less. Along the plains, there is coconut and paddy. In the higher regions, we have pepper, tea, coffee, oranges, cardamom etc. If this whole area is formed into a province, it is very likely that it may be a self-suffi-

cient province. The area will be about 21,000 square miles in size, with a population of about 163 lakhs of people, just sufficient to form a province.

I do not hold that language is not an important factor. What I say is that there are other factors equally important as language. We have to see, if the new provinces we form on a linguistic basis, will be economically self-sufficient capable of better and successful planning and efficient administration. The Leader of the House introducing in the debate the other day said that he did not want to unsettle the present established order. I cannot understand why he should be afraid of unsettling the present order. We have unsettled ever so many things. The British Empire we have unsettled. The caste system we have unsettled and the zamindari system we have unsettled. And we are going to unsettle the system of land tenure in the country. Therefore, why should he be afraid of unsettling the present order? We are definitely committed to the idea of linguistic provinces. My only objection is that on the score of language we should not form a province with insufficient area, with insufficient population and with little scope for expansion, or development. So, when we form these new provinces, in addition to the language, which is very important, we must pay attention to these other matters also. With these words, I commend my amendment.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: The sharply divided opinions, the conflicting views, that have been expressed now for two days in this House is proof enough, if proof was needed, that the proposition which this resolution places before this House is a highly contentious one. When I first got the resolution the question which came uppermost in my mind was whether we shall or we shall not ask ourselves even now whether it would not be more desirable in the interest of India to lay greater emphasis on our points of similarities rather than on our points of differences, be they even linguistic? This question of language raises many issues and some people even raise the question of culture which is, of course, in my opinion meaningless—there are not many cultures in this country; from one end of the country to the other—it is all, if I may say so, one homogeneous culture...

An Hon. Member: Agriculture.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Well, if my friend only understands culture by agriculture. I wish him the joy of it. Now, we have, therefore, to consider

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

this matter from the standpoint whether, even if there are some differences, we shall perpetuate those differences by localising them in smaller areas where naturally the differences will persist and will occupy a high position, or we shall so conduct ourselves that all these differences, even of language, may ultimately merge into that vast ocean of the great unification movement that is going on in this country, and very rightly too. This, in my opinion, ought to be the main guide for this House to come to a decision on questions of this nature. The basis, if I may say so, of most of the speeches made here for linguistic distribution of provinces is the Congress resolution passed sometime ago. I shall take a minute of your time in trying to read that resolution to the House (*Interruptions*). Kindly be patient for a little while. The Congress resolution says:

"The Congress has stood for full opportunities for the people as a whole to grow and develop according to their own wishes and genius. It has stood for the freedom of each group and territorial areas within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger frame-work and it has stated that for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted, as far as possible, on a linguistic and cultural basis".

11 A.M.

If we read this Congress resolution carefully, we will have to come to one conclusion and one alone, that is, they were not dogmatic about it in their resolution. They were, in my opinion, very circumspect: they used the words "as far as possible". Surely it cannot be denied that where other conditions are favourable, where the financial implications are such as would permit of having a province, where the administrative difficulties could be got over, naturally one class of people have to live together—in fact, they have grown in the past together and that has been the whole history of society. But now to be told that the whole of this country should be reconstituted on the basis of linguistic considerations, only in my opinion, is, to say the least, most premature.

This question was once put to Gandhiji himself in September 1944 by some journalist who questioned "Why not divide India according to language and culture?". The answer which Gandhiji gave, apart from various other things which he said, was: "It seems to me fantastic and impossible. I do

not see the slightest chance for such redistribution". Now, Sir, this matter was dealt with, as you will remember, in this House last year when Shri Rajagopalachari, who is so well conversant with the agitation for these linguistic provinces in his own province, said while replying to the debate as follows:

"Our sense of property is unfortunately still very strong and very alive. We seem to imagine that these territorial divisions of our State are to us so much property and we like to talk as if we lose something or we gain something. What really is the matter here? The matter is one of communications, of facility of administration, of effectiveness of the Government and the like."

Now, he further says:

"Just now there is another fear, another threat if I may call it, which is hanging in the horizon—I refer to linguistic division. We may exaggerate the desire to think of each as a separate entity".

These are authoritative opinions, weighty opinions, of people who have—whether we agree with their politics or we do not—given of their best to the country. Some of them know the difficulties and also the problems of linguistic provinces, but even they make no equivocal statement about it. They are most unequivocal and say: "This is not the time". That is, to put it very moderately, because what else could be said on it? Several distinguished speakers here today said the same thing—that this is not the opportune time for it. You will remember, Sir, that the Constituent Assembly had appointed a Special Committee to go into this question. The Committee was composed of an eminent Judge, an eminent administrator and an eminent public man. Now, let us see what they say. This Committee, composed of Mr. Dar of the Allahabad High Court, Dr. Panna Lal, another important executive officer who rose to the rank of a member of the Executive Council and Mr. Jagat Narain Lal, came to this conclusion—and the House will see the strong language they have used and the emphasis they have laid on their point of view:

"It may, therefore, be safely assumed that linguistic groups as sub-nations do not exist anywhere at present. But if the intentions were to bring sub-nations into existence, there could not be a better way of doing it than by putting together these differing elements in a linguistic province.

An autonomous linguistic province, in other words means an autonomous linguistic State and an autonomous linguistic State means in the words of one of its exponents, that its territories are inviolate. And if in a linguistic province the majority language group comes to regard the territory of the entire province as exclusively its own, the time cannot be far distant when it will come to regard the minority living in that province and people living outside it as not their own. And once that stage is reached, it will only be a question of time for that sub-nation to consider itself a full nation."

I would like this House to give due consideration to the opinions expressed by those who have given their best thoughts and who had before them all the materials. This is the opinion expressed by a Committee appointed by a body like the Constituent Assembly. It will thus be seen that this matter is really such that there are differing opinions both in favour and against it, and both have strong feelings about it. But even considering it from the mere practical point of view, I do not know where you will draw a line because whatever you do you will have to have these bilingual areas. The border will continue to be bilingual; bordering areas, even now, mostly are all bilingual, and once we start distributing areas on a linguistic basis we will really not know where to stop because this difference of language in this country, as you know, varies from place to place and even at a distance of fifty or hundred miles you will find some difference. Are these differences to be perpetuated? In Bihar the difference between Maithili and Magadhi is quite pronounced.

What I therefore submit is that language could not therefore be the proper criterion for the redistribution of States. As you, Sir, said and others said before you, there must be other considerations with which this might also weigh. This is a proposition not peculiar to India alone. Foreign countries like Spain, Switzerland, Belgium and the South American States, almost all of them, are bilingual or even multi-lingual, but no attempt has been made there to distribute the country on the basis of linguistic areas. In Europe an attempt was made in Belgium by Napoleon when he amalgamated the French-speaking people of Belgium with the French-speaking people in the adjoining areas, but that was not accepted, there was a revolution and ultimately, it had to be undone.

Coming to the points raised about the Bengal-Bihar boundary, the position as appears to me is that this matter has been considered by people on either side more on sentiment than on reason. Dr. Mookerjee, as you know, is a great orator and an orator appeals to the sentiment more than to reason. (An Hon. Member: What about you?) We are ordinary mortals, we shall try to appeal to reason and give you figures. Let me say at once that Bihar is not objecting to this proposal on account of any ill-will. We know what we owe to Bengal. If we go to the law courts of Bihar even today they still resound with the judicial decisions of Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee. If we go to an educationist he still aspires to be what Sir Ashutosh was once. So it is not due to ill-will. If you go to any district court or to any bar association, or look at the judiciary or the executive services, you will find that there is a large proportion of Bengalis who for all practical purposes are Biharis except for the difference that they take a little too much of fish as compared to the normal Bihari. But otherwise they are as good as Biharis and we are treating them like that. What really surprised me was that Dr. Mookerjee in his speech talked about living space. When reading Hitler's biography called *Mein Kampf* I come across the word *lebensraum*. I did not know the meaning of the word. I tried to find it out and I learnt that *lebensraum* also meant living space. I try to draw no analogy or similarity between what Dr. Mookerjee said and what is in *Mein Kampf*. But I only want to say how this word *lebensraum* has caught public imagination and what havoc it has created in the world. Dr. Mookerjee also said that but for the partition and East Bengal going to Pakistan perhaps he would not have raised this question. Permit me to say that that is not the position. Even in 1912 after the amalgamation of Bengal this question was raised and my friend, Mr. Guha said that it had all the support of different people. I have not got the time, otherwise I would have read out to you the reply which was sent by the then Government of India to the representation which was submitted by the Bengali people. All I will say is that it was rejected outright. Analysing the position from the point of view of finance and population of Bihar and Bengal, you will be surprised to find that West Bengal today has got 35 per cent. of the population of undivided Bengal and it has 36 per cent. of the area. Dr. Mookerjee mentioned something about the density of population. He said West Bengal had a density of 806. He forgot to take into consideration the fact that Calcutta and the suburban

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

areas of Calcutta itself have about 22 per cent. of the population of the entire West Bengal and if that is excluded and the density is then considered of the rest of West Bengal he will find that the density is not very much higher than in other parts of the country. West Bengal has got almost the entire industrial wealth of undivided Bengal and all the coal and iron and other minerals. West Bengal has also got 99 per cent. of the total electric energy of undivided Bengal. This is what West Bengal has got after the partition and it has got a population of about 2.40 crores. Bihar, as compared to that, has got a population of four crores and the density in Bihar, if we exclude Chhota Nagpur which is hilly forest waste land, it is 720 whereas in some districts like Muzaffarpur, Saran and Darbhanga the density is nearly 1100 per square mile. With regard to the finances of West Bengal even today after partition the total revenue is pretty large. The total revenue before partition was Rs. 44 crores; after partition it is between Rs. 32 and 34 crores. I have taken the figures of 1950-51 and 1949-50. The per capita expenditure on the population of West Bengal after partition is Rs. 14 per head whereas in Bihar our total revenue being about Rs. 22 crores the per capita expenditure on the basis of a population of four crores is only rupees five. So even in its partitioned condition the per capita expenditure in West Bengal is nearly Rs. 14 whereas in Bihar it is only rupees five.

Coming to the two or three districts to which a special reference was made by Dr. Mookerjee, namely Manbhum, Singhbhum etc., it has been represented by Mr. Guha in his speech that these parts perhaps belonged at one time to Bengal. I am glad Dr. Mookerjee has come back to his seat. Now referring to those districts. I will point out that these parts have been in Bihar ever since the Moghul period and Jehangir in his autobiography wrote about them:

این ولایت تعبه صوبه بهار و پٹنہ است

He says these parts are under the management or under the jurisdiction of the Government of Bihar in Patna. The decennial report published in the time of Lord Sinha when he was Governor of Bihar says:

"When the dewani was granted by Shah Alum to East India Company, Manbhum came under British influence as an integral part of Bihar."

There is another important consideration. The law governing the people in this area is not *Dayabhaga* but it is the law operating elsewhere in Bihar, that is, *Mitakshara*.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that so even in respect of Bengalis there?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do they not take their personal law?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): They take their personal law.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I am talking of the general law prevailing in that part of the district.

There has been a lot of talk about linguistic distribution of States. I have taken the latest figures from the census report, part of which has been circulated to us. Manbhum is composed of two sub-divisions. In Dhanbad the Hindi-speaking population is 80 per cent. and in Purulia, the other part, the Bengali-speaking population is 35 per cent. and the rest is Hindi-speaking.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Which census are you taking?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: 1951 census.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Six lakhs filled forms are missing.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I do not know that. The allegation is that previously the report had been prepared in such a way that the percentage went up to 80.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Let us have another census.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: There is no objection to that. Have a plebiscite, if you choose. We have also heard about Purnea. I need not say anything about the Bengali-speaking population there. It is not even six or seven per cent. In Kishanganj it was nineteen per cent. but since most of the Muslims speaking Bengali have gone over to Pakistan, the percentage now may not be even nine.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: He should know it was 80 per cent. in 1921.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I do not know about 1921. I am talking of 1951. It is much better that we come to conclusions on the latest figures. What he says is only past history. There is one thing which I heard from Mr. Harindranath Chattopadhyaya when he spoke the other day. He said, "I am an Andhra". I was very happy. I said to myself, "If a

(Chattopadhyaya can be an Andhra, why could not a Mookerjee be a Bihari?" Therefore, the distinction between Andhras and Biharis, or Biharis and Bengalis, does not really exist.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee : Why could not a Sahaya be a Bengali?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : Certainly. I am absolutely with you. That is my point. The proposition placed before the House raises very difficult questions. Even now I would appeal to the House to consider whether it would be desirable for us to persist in these differences. Dr. Mookerjee himself said in his speech now and on a previous occasion that linguistic differences need not be perpetuated. It is an exceedingly difficult proposition. I know that sentiment runs high on this question. I would recall what Burke in one of his memorable speeches in the House of Commons said. "It is easy to get power; it is difficult to get wisdom." These are wise words coming from one of the guardian angels of democracy.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee : That is why you should take advantage of this and accept our proposal.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : God has given us freedom: let us pray that he may also give us wisdom, so that we may unite and not divide on issues even linguistic.

Shri Nijalingappa (Chitaldrug) : A number of speeches have been made. Barring a few individuals' opinions, the majority of opinions is in favour of the formation of linguistic provinces as early as possible. This principle has been accepted and adopted, and the Working Committee of the Congress has been reiterating this principle all along. The Leader of the House, Pandit Nehru, quoted the election manifesto when he spoke the other day and stated that the Congress stood by it. Immediately after the manifesto was adopted at Bangalore, the representatives of all the Congress Committees and other Committees working for the formation of these provinces in the South met at Bangalore and passed a resolution on the 15th July 1951. It reads as follows:

"This meeting of representatives from Andhra, Maharashtra, Vindhya, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamilnad and Nagpur, including the Presidents of Vidharbha, Nagpur, Maharashtra and Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committees is gratified to note the inclusion in the Congress Election Manifesto of a reference to some practical

steps that should be taken in order to implement the formation of Linguistic Provinces in the South and West of India.

This meeting feels that to reassure the vast body of people in the concerned areas about the earnestness of the Government's intentions, a definite step should be taken to pave the way for the early formation of such provinces. Such step should be the early appointment of a Boundary Commission as contemplated in the Congress Election Manifesto.

This meeting further expresses the hope that the people concerned will put forth every endeavour in arriving at broad and general agreement in respect of boundaries and other important matters connected with this problem.

This meeting is further of opinion that it is the duty of the people concerned to abide by the verdict of the Commission that may be appointed in this behalf and of any allied tribunal charged with the settlement of contentious matters.

This meeting appeals to the respective P. C. C.s and other representatives to arrive at agreed conclusion as far as possible and undertake to abide by the verdicts of the Commission or tribunal as the case may be."

After this resolution was adopted by the representatives of the various provinces, the matter again came up before the Working Committee and the Working Committee was pleased to pass a resolution at my instance on the 12th August 1951. It reads as follows:

"The Congress in its election manifesto adopted at Bangalore has reiterated its adherence to the principle of the formation of Linguistic Provinces regard being had also to other considerations, such as economic, administrative and financial. The Working Committee feel that there is general agreement on this subject among the concerned parties in South India in view of the fact that the Pradesh Committees of Tamilnad, Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra and Maharashtra have already expressed themselves in favour of such provisions.

The Working Committee are therefore of opinion that when the Government of India are satisfied that the necessary agreement exists they should take requisite

[Shri Nijalingappa]

steps to implement this demand and to appoint a Boundary Commission as early as possible."

So, that is the position. I feel that the speeches or opinions delivered against the formation of linguistic provinces are irrelevant and out of court now, because people want linguistic provinces and they will have to be given. No doubt, there are difficulties in the way and they will have to be got over. During the last four or five years, there were grave difficulties and India has met them very carefully and satisfactorily. I do not think we are having so many difficulties now. There may never come a time in the history of a nation when there would not be any difficulties at all, because difficulties are there to be met and they will always be there. If there are no difficulties before a nation, if there are no problems to be solved, I think that that nation will suffer from inertia. Today the time has come when we have to take courage in both hands and proceed.

Shri R. N. Singh (Ghazipur Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—South West): They have no courage.

Shri Nijalingappa: My friend has changed his views during the last six months. Before that we had all the courage and all the necessary pluck to make India free. A nation that has won its independence will have no difficulty in solving these small problems. Let me assure my friend of that. It is very difficult for the faithful also when the unfaithful quote scriptures.

So, knowing that there is such a large measure of agreement on this demand, I entirely support Kaka Gadgil in the views that he expressed when he spoke last. Pandit Nehru when he spoke made a reference to the overlapping of these provinces. That is a fact. But I feel that instead of being a difficulty, it is an advantage to have these overlapping areas because whenever there are two linguistic areas adjacent to each other, as between those two areas there is bound to be a place where both the languages are spoken and understood. This bilingual area is to be found in and around every province. So far as my own province is concerned, viz. Karnataka, on one side we have Andhra; on another we have Maharashtra; on another Telugu area; and on the fourth we have Kerala. People in these overlapping areas speak and understand Kannada, Telugu, Marathi and Malayalam.

There will be this bilingual belt of about five miles or sometimes twenty miles. Therefore, if a Boundary Commission consisting of men of probity, understanding and human insight goes into the problem, it will not be difficult at all to fix the boundary lines between the provinces. And if they are once fixed, even if the boundary looks arbitrarily fixed I can tell you the people will not be very much worried. Because those who have been agitating about this matter are mostly Congressmen, though now there are other adherents who are also agitating for their own purposes. Here I remember a small story. We had a friend in the Election Committee four or five years back. Whenever a name came up for acceptance to be set up as a candidate he would quietly sit. But when any particular name was about to be adopted he would speak very vehemently in favour of that candidate. Because, he knew that the name would be accepted. And he would go out and tell the candidate: "I have fought for you. There was so much opposition against you; everybody was against you. But because I insisted that you must be set up, you have been accepted as a candidate." I feel that is the attitude now taken by my friends opposite. Of course they are also supporting it. But apart from this, we who have been working in close touch with the masses, we know that if a Boundary Commission is appointed and if those boundaries are marked it will be quietly accepted and there will not be any trouble in that behalf. And as the President of a Pradesh Congress Committee—there are also others and I have been in close touch with them—let me assure the Government and everybody here that there will not be any trouble when these areas are marked. So that is the one question which has to be tackled now.

Of course language is not the only consideration when fixing the boundaries, because, as I know, in Maharashtra there are some Kannadigas whose mother tongue is Kannada. But they will not like to come to Karnataka. Similarly there are Maharashtrians living in Karnataka. But they will not like to go to Maharashtra on the mere ground that Marathi is their mother tongue. Similarly there are people in Mysore speaking Telugu. On that account they do not say "if there is an Andhra province we will go there" because their relationship with Mysore has been so vital and binding for a number of years and they will not like to go away. Therefore, in forming these provinces language is not the only criterion. You will have to ascertain the views of the

people. It is one of the guiding principles in fixing the boundaries. But I do not say it is the only consideration. There are a number of places where such things have happened. There are geographical considerations to be taken into account. We will have to see how far a province is viable and all those other considerations, though it is true that we have not been following it. We have got small provinces like Ajmer and Coorg which cannot maintain themselves. Still we have got them. Therefore, it is high time that we sit together and see that new provinces, which are viable, which are neither too large nor too small, are formed. And in doing so we can also give sufficient emphasis on this linguistic question. Therefore, I say that mere language is not the only consideration but there are other considerations also.

But in considering the matter whether a province is economically viable and all that, we need not spend much time. Because a province may be poor today. It may be poor because its resources are not exploited. That happens in Karnataka also. Its resources are very vast, but today it may not look viable—though it is so according to experts. There we need not take too much account of these things. These things can be studied and gone into in detail and the opinion of experts taken. But the will of the people is paramount in this respect. My submission therefore is that these things should be given as much consideration as possible, but they need not be the entire consideration.

Some friend is asking me about Mysore. As a person belonging to Mysore and representing Mysore and also as President of the Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee for the last seven years I should like to remove certain confusions about this matter. The formation of Karnataka Province is being urged both by Mysoreans and people from Karnataka outside Mysore. This began in 1915 after the Andhras began their agitation in 1913. The first conference met in Bangalore. Let me also submit that it is the Mysore people that began the agitation for Karnataka Province. And that went on. And during all this struggle for freedom, though Mysore did not enter into the freedom struggle till 1936, a large number of people went into Karnataka and joined the satyagraha movement and hundreds of them went to jail. Mysore also helped in a number of ways. Similarly in 1947 and earlier, when we started a struggle for responsible Government in Mysore, thousands of volunteers came from Karnataka and

helped in the movement. So we have been growing like that. The demand was not for Mysore but for the rest of Karnataka being made into a province. That went on for a number of years. But as we came closer the demand that we should come together grew. The Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee was one for Mysore as well as outside.

Let me not go back before 1946. After the provincial Government was formed at the Centre, a conference, at which thousands of delegates from all parts of Karnataka came, met in Davangere. Then the people expected that the linguistic provinces would immediately come because our own leaders had come to power, and they thought it would be a matter of days or months. Then we put forth a resolution after some consultation that for the time being, leaving aside Mysore and Hyderabad, the rest of the Union areas may become a province, to which Mysore and Hyderabad could be added later on. And I remember the amount of dissatisfaction and the amount of anger that was exhibited by my friends in Mysore. Because they said: "How can you have a Karnataka Province without Mysore? We object to this resolution. It is reactionary. When there is a chance of forming a province you want to leave us and form a province without Mysore. We object to it." And after a good deal of persuasion I and some friends made them accept it. There were very important people from Mysore in that conference.

There were a series of resolutions passed by the Mysore Congress and I will only refer to one or two of them. After Mysore got responsible Government the Mysore Congressmen wanted their own Pradesh Congress Committee and the people on the other side rather took exception to it. Because they said: "Karnataka is one; you have also been urging for there being one Karnataka and that Mysore also should be added on to it; but now you are asking for a different Pradesh Committee." At Birur on 6th November 1948 a resolution was passed to the following effect:

"This Session of the All Mysore Congress Committee, taking note of the fact that grave misunderstandings have arisen because of the recent resolutions of the Mysore Congress regarding the formation of the Mysore State into a separate Congress unit, expresses its definite opinion that these resolutions could not be taken as an indication of separation but that was occasioned by practical

[Shri Nijalingappa]

reasons. The All Mysore Congress Committee is of the opinion that so long as Mysore is a separate administrative unit, the Parliamentary activities within the State could not be guided and controlled effectively by an Ad Hoc Committee of the K.P.C.C. It is further of opinion that the moment Mysore and other parts of Karnataka Province come under one administration, there will be no necessity for different Provincial Congress Committees.

With this end only in view, the Mysore Congress has been urging upon the Indian National Congress to recognise the Mysore State as a distinct provincial Congress unit.

The Mysore Congress has always accepted the principle of formation of linguistic provinces as laid down by the Indian National Congress. Kannada territory having been torn into pieces and placed under 19 different administrations could not make all round progress. All the Kannada speaking people are tied together by common culture and heritage. Their economic interests are identical. Therefore, even now the A.M.C.C. stands by the previous declaration that a United Karnataka under the constitutional rulership of H. H. the Maharaja is essential and inevitable. The A.M.C.C. has also realized that there are hurdles in the way of forming one single administration for the entire Kannada territory immediately."

The Constituent Assembly of Mysore, in its Objectives resolution has made the position clear, because that resolution says that there must be provision to add the adjoining areas to Mysore. I need not take the House through all that. In order to carry on the discussions with the Government of India, with the leaders of public opinion both in Mysore and the Union Karnataka and with H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore a Sub-Committee was formed. After the Sub-Committee submitted its report a final resolution was passed as follows:

"The Working Committee of the Mysore Congress after having considered the report of the sub-committee constituted by the A.M.C.C. at Birur regarding the formation of the Karnataka Province including Mysore, hereby reiterates the stand taken by the Congress from time to

time that the formation of such a State with His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore as the constitutional head thereof, is desirable and is of opinion that such a State should be formed in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Indian Constitution Act in this behalf."

After this resolution was adopted by the Mysore Congress many of my Mysore friends approached me and said that we have done all that was possible so far as Mysore was concerned but what has been done on the other side? We have definitely accepted the Maharaja as the Ruler. Regarding the capital, Bangalore is a fine place and we could have the capital there. I considered the problem. There was some objection to the Maharaja being accepted as the constitutional head, because the J.V.P. report said that no part of the Union can be tagged on to a Rajpramukh's State.

After the acceptance of the Constitution in 1950 there was no necessity to make this difference. Every Governor or Rajpramukh has similar position and powers and it did not matter. After all the Mysore ruler was a fine man and our own man. So they finally adopted a resolution last year saying that the Karnataka Provincial Congress accepts the Maharaja as the head and they were ready to accept Bangalore as the capital. The matter stands there.

When States or governments are formed, even small ones, certain interests develop and if you allow more time, more interests develop. Perhaps ten years later more interests will be developed. Certain attempts are being made to show that Mysore is against it. There have been some telegrams and some memoranda . . .

Shri Madiha Gowda (Bangalore South): The majority of the State representatives have voted against it.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): It is easy to collect such signatures.

Shri Nijalingappa: I am speaking only as a Congressman. The Congress had accepted these things. It has brought freedom to India. . . .

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): All the Opposition parties have accepted it.

Shri Nijalingappa: Speaking primarily as a Congressman, that is the position today. If there is any misunderstanding let it be removed. If the Mysore people do not want it, they cannot be dragged into it. In their

own interest I am saying this, because Mysore suffers from certain deficiencies. It is not self-sufficient in food and raw materials. It has got fine technical skill and I want them to exploit the rest of the vast Karnataka resources. It is for that purpose that I have been agitating. However, the other part of Karnataka is also viable. Whatever it may be, I feel the time has come when a Boundary Commission should be appointed so that these matters may be decided.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri K. N. Desai.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): May I ask it during the debate the Tamil Nad and Travancore Tamil Nad Congress members will have an opportunity to reply to certain issues that were raised?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Every one will have his chance. Mr. Desai.

Shri K. N. Desai (Surat): Some reference was made the other day in speeches about the idea of Maha Gujarat. Therefore, I owe it to this House to explain what the position of Gujarat is. So far as the Congress in Gujarat is concerned, it has never used the word "Maha Gujarat". What is known as Maha Gujarat is nothing more than the inclusion of Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch and the Gujarat Congress has never used this word.

The second point is that so far as Gujarat is concerned it has never joined in a demand for a linguistic province. That is the opinion of the Congress in Gujarat and in deference to some of our friends from Maharashtra it has not even pressed for the inclusion of Saurashtra in the Bombay State, even though we are in a minority in Bombay State and the people and Government of Saurashtra wanted it for the good government of Saurashtra. It is not merely the opinion of the Gujarat Congress but it is also the opinion of many people who count in Gujarat. That is the position so far as Gujarat is concerned.

However, as we know, our friends from Maharashtra and Karnataka want to split up Bombay and we do not want to come in their way. But the question is not so simple as it appears to be. There is bound to be a very great deal of controversy about the border areas. Those who were Members of the Provisional Parliament will remember the controversy about Dangs. It was placed by the Bombay Government in Surat district. My hon. friend Shri Gadgil will say

by the Political Department. The Delimitation Committee was equally divided in its opinion. The Election Commission placed Dangs with Surat district and the Cabinet also adhered to this decision. However, the hon. Prime Minister had to appoint a Committee to settle the question and of course we settled it amicably without any rancour or bitterness.

What I say is that there is bound to be controversy about the border areas and these questions are not so simple as they are supposed. The most crucial point is the question of Bombay. I know that my Maharashtrian friends want Bombay in Maharashtra. (An Hon. Member: It is already there.) Gujarat does not claim it. But this claim is bound to be resisted by a very substantial and influential section of the people of Bombay itself. (An Hon. Member: Businessmen and capitalists.) What I mean to say is that the question is not so simple as it appears to be. It is all very well to talk of mutual agreement. Of course, if mutual agreement is possible it must be brought about. But I do not think that any mutual agreement is possible. Therefore, the only other course is, as my hon. friend Mr. Nijalingappa pointed out, the appointment of a Boundary Commission.

But then the question is, is the time opportune at the present moment for the Commission to be appointed? It is true that during the last five years we have settled many questions. Yet we cannot say that our country is sufficiently settled in conditions. The law and order situation in many parts of the country is not very satisfactory. We have to attain self-sufficiency in many things, especially food. So if a Boundary Commission is appointed now, it is sure to result in deflecting the people's mind from the more important questions that demand a solution and divert their mind to this question.

So far as Gujarat is concerned, though it does not want linguistic provinces, even though it is in a minority, it does not want to come in the way of those who want linguistic provinces. At the same time I say that the only solution is the appointment of a Boundary Commission but for that the time is not opportune. So, my only request and suggestion is, let us wait.

Shri Alagesan (Chingleput): The debate has gone on for more than six hours and at long last I am glad that one representing the Tamil area has been called to speak. It looked as if there are no representatives in this

[Shri Alagesan]

House from the Tamil area, more so from Madras. There was much bandying of words about the city of Madras. Several hon. Members spoke about the position that it should take under the future redistribution scheme. Then, Sir, I was wondering what happened to representatives from the city of Madras, in this House. There are several of them. The South of Madras is very ably represented by my hon. friend Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, who, fortunately or unfortunately, has got into the Treasury Benches and therefore his mouth is shut. But, that does not mean that nobody in this House knows his opinion about the city of Madras. Again, three-eighth of the City of Madras is represented equally ably by my hon. friends Mr. Natesan and Shrimati Chandrashekhar. I hope they will be given an opportunity to speak their minds. They will be really voicing the opinion of the people of Madras in this matter, where they want to remain, and where they want to be tagged on. Up till now, the debate has assumed a titled and unreal aspect, because, the real representatives of the city of Madras in this House have not been called upon to give their opinion in this matter.

I shall first deal with the immediate background of this resolution and then take up some of the controversial points that have been raised by my friends from Andhra area. If I have counted rightly, so far five of them, including you, Sir, have spoken, and several from the Kerala area, and several others from the Karnataka area have also spoken. This demand for linguistic provinces is more emotional in content than either political or economic. People are deeply stirred over this question, and very much agitated and in the Andhra area people are going on fast. I do not know whether to call it *satyagraha* or otherwise and they demand linguistic provinces. It is a sort of glorification of the past. When the achievements of the people become memories of the past, it is language that holds up the mirror to those achievements and reminds them of those achievements. When everything else decays and dies, language alone lives. It is because of this that language evokes the deepest emotions in the human heart. Take a Maharashtrian, for instance. He dreams of the valiant days of Shivaji and longs to re-live them.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): That is not correct.

Shri Alagesan: I do not know. He contemplates the great saint of Maharashtra and his sacred *abhangs*, and

feels very much elevated. So also my Andhra friends dream of the empire of the pre-Christian era, which had nothing in common with the present Telugu except the name, Andhra.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Those days of empires are gone.

Shri Alagesan: Yet, the dream is there. The Tamil poets—there are poets in this House too—have sung how Tamilian kings conquered the North Indian chieftains and planted their flag on the Himalayas. They have very discreetly omitted all mention of the defeats that they suffered at the hands of others. The hon. Finance Minister, the clever man that he is, quoted a simple *Kural* from the book of Tiruvalluvar, ending his reply to the general discussion on the Budget and the whole of Tamilnad was aglow with pride that here is a Finance Minister, who is himself a Maharashtrian, but has chosen to quote *Kural*. Even if he had set apart about ten crores to the Tamil area, he would not have evoked such a response, because the people would have still said, here is a Finance Minister who could have given much more, but he has given only this much.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): Twenty crores.

Shri Alagesan: That is the magic that language exercises over the minds of men. If the people and their representatives are agitated over it, I can perfectly understand that.

Just as my hon. friend Mr. Nijalingappa said a few minutes ago, our friends opposite have not been slow to seize this question of high emotional value and they have come out as the champions of linguistic provinces. They are the foremost in demanding redistribution on a linguistic basis. That is perfectly understandable. It would be very interesting to know from them how many languages and dialects they have recognised for the purpose of linguistic redistribution. There are certain languages in this country which do not have any script. For instance, the language of my hon. friend Mr. Malliah. He speaks Konkani; it has no script. Yet, my hon. friends opposite would give him the luxury of a separate State, because they would recognise even dialects. We should improve them; we should develop them; that is what they would say. There is another language called Tulu, which is spoken in a portion of South Kanara. Half of that district will go to Tulu and half to Konkani. If my friends opposite have their way, they will have the entire country cut up

into all sorts of little linguistic bits so that there may not be the requisite amount of unity and solidarity in the country. They would ask us to follow the blazing example of the Fatherland and ask us to develop every little dialect, because it serves their purpose eminently well. We now carry on our public affairs through the medium of one language and that too a foreign language. Though the language is one we could voice different opinions. Yesterday, we saw how the hon. Home Minister had his opinion changed and introduced a major change in the Bill in deference to the wishes of the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri Alagesan: I want to give you that credit; you do not want it?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): No; I seldom change my opinion.

Shri Alagesan: When our friends opposite have it all their own way, they would not have any diversity of opinion. They will enforce total conformity and uniformity. Having ensured that, they would allow any amount of diversity in language. What if there are 100 languages? They will all sing the same chorus; they will sing the greatness of the State symbolised in its Head. So, it suits them very well to bring up this question at this moment and try to weaken this country. It will be very profitable to enquire how our friends who believe in ultracentralism seemingly adopt a course which decentralises power in the hands of the various linguistic units. Therein lies the secret of their strategy. They adopt methods which are diametrically opposite to the ends that they desire.

I shall pass on to the various controversial points that have been raised by my hon. friends coming from the Andhra area. First of all, it was said that the people's wishes should be consulted. We have no objection to that. Only I say that the people's wishes have already been consulted. They have given their opinion and verdict in the last elections. I shall prove it. There is a very eminent Andhra leader. The House heard the story from the Prime Minister how the Andhras were within an inch of having their province and they let it slip through their fingers. It was one man who said that he will not accept Andhra Province without the city of Madras, and so it had to be given up. And that gentleman had the wisdom to seek election from one of the city constituencies to demonstrate the accuracy of the opinion he was voicing. Then

the people gave their verdict and said: "You have to lose the deposit; you have no hold on the place."

Shri B. Das (Jaipur—Keonjhar): The election was not fought on that ground by Mr. Prakasam.

Shri Alagesan: It was, Sir. The people very shrewdly guessed that if they gave their vote to Mr. Prakasam—I did not want to mention his name, but since the hon. Member has mentioned it, I have to repeat it—they shrewdly guessed that if he was returned by them. . . .

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: On a point of order, Sir. Is it in order to speak about a person who is not here in Parliament?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing disparaging in the hon. Member saying that a particular person was a propagandist of the Andhra Province and the inclusion of Madras city in that. There is no harm whatever if it is mentioned. The name by itself is not objectionable, unless anything objectionable is said about the person who has not the right to defend himself here. (*Interruption*) Order, order. That is my ruling.

Shri Alagesan: That is why they gave their vote against him, because they knew that the vote would be misappropriated for the purpose of claiming the city of Madras for the Andhra province, and so they anticipated this and asked him to go. Of course, I recognise that my Andhra friends are highly emotional. The Tamilians do not clamour as much for their own province. But why? It is not because we do not want the province. It is because we have a greater sense of realism. Even if the Andhra State is separated, the remainder will still be a composite State. There will be the Malayalees in it, there will be the Canarese in it. We are not going to ask them to go away. So, we have developed that sense of practical values, and we are carrying on. That is why you do not find here any clamour for a separate Tamil province, but that does not mean that we do not want one.

I shall give you a simple example how this question not being solved comes in the way at all times. Recently, just a little time ago, the Postal Department proposed to issue certain new stamps with the ensigns of various poets of the country on them. I found Meera and Tagore and Tulsi-das—perhaps he is the only poet in Hindi—and some others. I asked the Deputy Minister of Communications why he had omitted the famous Tamil poet Subramania Bharati. His reply

[Shri Alagesan]

was: "We considered this question. We wanted to have Bharati, but then, we could not think of a Telugu poet so that both can be issued at the same time. And so Bharati had to be left out." That is the wonderful understanding that even our Ministers and the Central Government have of this issue. Hence, we will be happier if this issue is solved at an early date. There are one or two points I wish to make.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are many other hon. Members wishing to speak.

Shri Alagesan: When the hon. Member representing the golden part of this country criticised another hon. Member who said some brave words in this debate and asked how he could claim Kolar district for the Andhra Province, he referred him to the resolution of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee. It is an archaic resolution. There is the latest resolution on the subject passed by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, and it says that the Andhras have no claim to the city of Madras. I would draw the attention of the hon. Member who spoke the brave words to take note of the resolution, realise the situation and act accordingly. Mention was made—I shall finish on this subject; I have got a lot to say, but since my time is up, I shall finish. I do hope the hon. Member representing the city of Madras will be called to speak. Reference was made to the J.V.P. report. . . .

12 Noon

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the hon. Member should not have spoken.

Shri Alagesan: I am sorry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member thinks the hon. Member who represents the city of Madras must have a preference, he should have kept quiet.

Shri Alagesan: When five Members from Andhra are called upon to speak, cannot two Members from Tamil Nad be allowed to speak? The representatives from Tamil Nad are most numerous in this House. They are 38 in number.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no trouble about the Tamil people.

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): When there is a question like this, our point of view is not sufficiently heard. That is our grievance, because we are 38 Members here and. . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: While I am in the Chair I am trying to regulate the debate without giving room for any grievance. The Andhra movement started long ago. So far as Tamil Nad is concerned, they never wanted a separate province. This is only the dispute about the city of Madras. It is enough if I call one hon. Member to speak on that.

Shri Natesan (Tiruvallur): The hon. Member has referred to me as coming from the city of Madras. It is not so much a question of Madras having a quarrel with the Andhra Province. It is a question of representing to the hon. Members of this House that really the Andhras have no claim on Madras city. That is the point. To that extent we should be allowed to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a negative point.

Shri Alagesan: I am sorry my time is being taken up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My point was, the resolution consists of two portions. The main point is the formation of the linguistic provinces. The other one is wherever there are some linguistic divisions disputes are raised regarding the boundaries. That is a smaller one. The question of Madras is only in the nature of a boundary dispute. The question whether Andhra Province should be formed or not is the main issue. Therefore, the hon. Member may conclude now.

An Hon. Member. On a point of information, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. There is no point of information now. Time is up.

Shri Vallatharas: I do not want to make myself prominent, but I want to make a submission. Nagercoil is very important to Tamil Nad. It claims from Trivandrum in the north to Nagercoil in the south. Nagercoil is now a part of Trivandrum. Every newspaper everyday publishes something about it, and the Deputy-Speaker must be aware of these things.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I only wanted to say that it is a matter of boundary dispute. It is not a question whether there should be a Tamil Province or not.

Shri Alagesan: I was making a reference to the J.V.P. report to which reference has already been made by my hon. friend sitting there. He very cleverly argued. "The J.V.P. report has, of course, said that the city of Madras cannot go to the Andhra Province, but it has not said that it should

go anywhere else, and so it may still go to the Andhra Province". I think that was the line of argument. Their intention is quite clear from the reading of the report, and I shall quote only a few relevant sentences. They say in the course of the report (*Interruption*).

Shri Vallatharas: Should the hon. Member be allowed to speak for 20 or 30 minutes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not take more time. There are other hon. Members wishing to speak.

Shri Alagesan: Sir, my submission is that my time is being stolen by the interrupters.

The report says:

"That is to say, that the people forming a new linguistic province will have to proceed on the basis of accepting only such areas as are clearly in favour of the linguistic province."

Again, they say:

"We are of opinion that if an Andhra Province is to be formed, its protagonists will have to abandon their claims to the city of Madras."

Madras city like the city of Bombay cannot be a separate province by itself.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Maharashtra cannot abandon Bombay. Let the hon. Member not talk about Bombay, but talk about Madras.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member cannot question his statement.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I question the purpose and meaning of the quotation.

Shri Alagesan: I am only quoting from the report, where they have said that the Bombay city can be constituted into a separate province. They have also said that the Madras city cannot on similar lines be constituted into a separate province. If it cannot go to the Andhra area and if it cannot be constituted into a separate province, then where shall it go? Will it go into the Bay of Bengal as you said? Can it go with the Malabar province? No. Can it form part of Karnataka province? No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It will remain where it is.

Shri Alagesan: I submit that it goes into the Tamil area, and will remain as a Tamil city, because it forms the 'face and the eyes' of the Tamil area.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I now call upon Sardar Hukam Singh.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Hon. Members from Mysore also should be given a chance to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members from Mysore and Karnataka have spoken already. I propose calling upon the hon. Minister at 12-30 P.M. Three Members can speak till that time, ten minutes each.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kaparthala-Bhatinda): I may not be able to finish my speech within ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can go on.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I thought there was general agreement so far as the principle was concerned. But I have heard now for the first time that some Members even doubt whether the Congress is pledged or committed to the formation of linguistic provinces. I need not go into these commitments and resolutions that have been passed from time to time because they have been referred to by some of my hon. friends. Anyhow, it was gratifying to observe, and to listen to some of the speeches made by hon. Members who really assured us that the Congress stood committed to this policy. Responsible Members of the Congress did say that the Congress stood committed, so far as the principle was concerned. But it was a surprise for me to hear from our hon. the Prime Minister that he could not agree to the general principles, though the question of one part could be taken separately. My view is that—I may be mistaken—so far as the general principle is concerned, there should be no doubt, or no dispute, and that we should all agree so far as the general principle is concerned. Then we can say whether we take up the question of West Bengal first or some other portion of the country first.

We are told that there are practical difficulties. There are difficulties. The Prime Minister had observed that there was no doubt that in 1927 at Madras, it was said by the Congress that the time had arrived when we should take up reconstruction of provinces on a linguistic basis. Then it was said only as a matter of principle, and the practical thing was not coming before us. I do feel that because we were idealists, and raising slogans we did not look to the side of the practical difficulties that would come up subsequently, and it may be, this also was a slogan or a plan for our advance towards freedom. But I submit that

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

because Congress was leading the emancipation movement, and our leaders were followed implicitly, while every word they said was obeyed by the masses, they were creating enthusiasm among the people, assuring them that as soon as freedom came, the country would be divided on a linguistic basis, and further they cannot have a real touch of freedom unless there were linguistic provinces. This attitude of theirs, and also the assurance and the commitments entered into by a number of Congress leaders have created a passion among the masses. They have taken the people so far, and now it is not possible to put them on the reverse gear. It may be the whole thing may turn turtle, if at this stage it were to be said that because there are difficulties, we are not going further, and that we should go back. If now, they feel that there are difficulties—certainly there are, I do admit—they are to be solved. It is not a nationalistic approach, but rather a bureaucratic one to say now that unless the people agree among themselves, we are not prepared to take up that question. The National Government has to take up that responsibility, and proceed further to solve the problem that it has created for itself. There is no question of going back, so far as I can see.

Then we have been told in the election manifesto that unless certain conditions are fulfilled, no province can be formed. I quite agree. There would certainly be other considerations that have to be taken into account. The present policy as enunciated by the Prime Minister on the 7th instant was that the conditions laid down in the election manifesto of 1951 still hold ground, and they are economic consideration, financial consideration, and administrative consideration, besides an agreement between the people concerned. I must submit with all humility that so far as the agreement is concerned, that would be difficult to achieve, if not impossible. Men are not angels, Indians also are human beings, differences there must be, we must differ on certain points. If the Government wants to proceed further, it shall have to do so in spite of differences. In spite of difficulties, it will have to do it. But if they lay down as a condition precedent that there must be agreement between the people concerned, then it would only be a device to shelve the thing, or to go back upon the commitments that they have already made.

If the idea is that it would create bitterness among the people if we proceed with the matter just now, then I am sure that by denying it, as our Prime Minister has done, we will create greater bitterness among the people. Feelings are being aroused, there is frustration and disappointment among the people who had voted for them in the hope that as soon as freedom is achieved, they will get this thing done. An idea of a millennium was put before the people, and it was said that there cannot be any freedom unless this country is divided into provinces on a linguistic basis. Therefore, my view is that if you do not do it now on the ground that the agreement among the people is not there, then there would be no contentment, concord or harmony. We would be only accentuating the forces of disruption and disappointment. This is general, so far as all parts of the country are concerned, because this is the condition prevailing in the north, south, east and west and everywhere.

Now I come to my own province which has been discriminated against, so far as this question is concerned. The first Tribunal or Commission that was appointed to go into the question was the Dar Commission, to which reference has been made by more than one speaker. Of course, the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly recommended that a Commission be appointed not for Andhra alone. They wanted to include Andhra as one of the States in the Constitution itself. Subsequently they said some inquiry should be made before Andhra or any province was put in the regular list of States. So, they recommended that a Commission be appointed, but added that that Commission should not go into the question of Andhra alone, but for all parts of the country. But it is an irony of fate that North India was not included in it. I do not know who was responsible for it. Their inquiry was confined only to Karnataka, Maharashtra and Andhra. (*An Hon. Member*: Because there was no agitation.) If the scheme is not to be examined on its own merits, but only if people in a certain area are vocal and raise a huge cry about it, then it is not fair. Not that there is agitation in one province and no agitation in the other.

This report was made on the 10th December 1948, just on the eve of the session of the Congress at Jaipur. Because Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya was to preside—and he had very strong feelings on it and therefore could not take it lying down—he put great

pressure and then a Committee known as the J.V.P. Committee was appointed. Of course, the greatest injustice that was done to North India was by the report of that Committee. Even when it was not needed, even when the reference had not been made to the Commission or to this Committee, they added that they were clearly of opinion that no question of rectification of boundaries in the provinces of North India should be raised at the present moment, whatever the merits of such a case. That is my difficulty. That created a lot of bitterness when they added this paragraph. Why should they exclude North India from consideration whatever the merits? That is not fair.

Then again, they admit on page 10 that this question of North India has its own merits. It is not without merits, they say:

"Even apart from our view of this reference to us, we are firmly of opinion that no such question should be raised at the present moment. This does not necessarily mean that the demands for adjustments of provincial boundaries are unjustified or without merit. We believe that there is some force in them and that some adjustments may ultimately become necessary. But we are convinced that for the present no such question should be raised".

That was most unfair and we were discriminated against.

We are told—just on the 7th also our Prime Minister made a reference—"that no question of a Sikh province arises. That would not be given. I shall have nothing to do with it". Some such words were used by the Prime Minister. Then I put a question, and I am going to substantiate that so far as the Akali Dal is concerned, so far as that representative body is concerned, it has never asked for a separate Sikh State. I claim that the Akali Dal is the only organisation that is representative of the Sikhs so far as politics are concerned. Congress Sikhs might say so, but they are part and parcel of the Congress. They cannot say that they have a separate entity of their own. They might claim—and I am not going to enter into that controversy—that they have a greater following. They are welcome to it if they have. But so far as this question is concerned, the Akali Dal is the only representative body. This was admitted in India's Minorities, a Government publication issued in 1948 where it was said:

"The Sikhs also have expressed their confidence in the Union and

its leader. In a Press Conference on November 29, 1948, Master Tara Singh, leader of the Akali party, which is the premier organisation of the Sikhs said: 'We shall continue to support the Congress and the Union Government in its task of reconstruction'."

Ch. Raghubir Singh (Agra Distt.—East): What about the Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee?

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is not a political body. It only manages Gurudwaras.

An Hon. Member: That is a religious body.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Up till 1947, we were no doubt with the Congress and it was agreed and admitted that the Akali Dal was the only premier organisation of the Sikhs. Now there is only one resolution of the Akali Dal where it is stated specifically:

"They therefore strongly feel the utter necessity of the speedy creation of a Punjabi-speaking province for the protection and preservation of their culture, language and self-respect..."

This is all. That is to say, we want this province simply on the basis of culture and language and nothing beyond it. Then, subsequently, at a party given at the Imperial Hotel, it was announced by the President of the Akali Dal:

"It must be made clear"—and Sir, this is very urgent, I should say—"and definitely understood that the Sikhs do not desire a separate state nor even necessarily a Sikh majority area. What they ask for is simply readjustment of boundaries on purely linguistic and cultural basis. They believe that the Punjabi has a distinctive taste, culture and a way of living. The present union of districts was effected purely for administrative purposes."

He further said:

"The Sikhs believe that they can secure this protection if a Punjabi-speaking province is conceded, for, then they would have more effective voice in the administration than at present. If the authorities can afford the same protection by any other methods, the Sikhs would not hesitate to consider them".

They were prepared to consider other methods also, if their culture and language could be safeguarded.

Then again, there was a mammoth congregation at Ludhiana. That conference also made it clear that a:

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

Punjabi-speaking area be demarcated on purely cultural and linguistic basis so as to preserve the Punjabi language and culture. Then again, this is the election manifesto that was drafted in 1951.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, the hon. Member's time is over.

Sardar Hukam Singh: There also it was made clear that "it is vital that a Punjabi-speaking province should be carved out from the different States of the country on the basis of Punjabi language and culture". Therefore, it is not fair to say that we want a Sikh State. It is a misrepresentation. It is very unfortunate that it has gone round.

What I want to stress is that our position is peculiar and different from any other part of the country. Perhaps that has never happened in the whole world. There may be differences between protagonists of two different languages. But our position is that the people of one State speaking one language have differences between themselves. It is not a conflict between Hindi and Punjabi. It is a conflict between Punjabi and Punjabi. That is most annoying because a portion of the Punjabi-speaking people themselves disown the language. They say, 'It is not our language'. We are told, 'Unless the majority agrees, your demand cannot be conceded'. Certainly that is most painful. If the majority agrees, then it is a national demand, but if the majority does not agree, then the demand is communal. If this is the definition, then communalism and nationalism would come to mean that whatever the majority wants—even though it be aggressive, it may tyrannise—that is nationalism, and whatever the minority wants, that is communalism! This is what I want to submit, that it should be decided on merits. If the majority disowns the language, as it is very clear it has done in the Census operations—if one were to go to the Jullundur division and just listen to two or three people talking together, they would be talking Punjabi, but if one were to ask the question, 'What is your language?', they would say 'Hindi'—that is the problem, and that has to be solved. It is not an easy problem. But it has to be solved. People, very respectable people, from the highest to the lowest ranks, disown the language.

Those who are responsible for the administration of the country did not care to inquire into this. It shows that

there is a disease, a morbid mentality, that has to be treated. That has to be diagnosed. It is no use going about and saying that because the Sikhs want it, they cannot have it because the majority have disowned their language. If they had not done so, there would have been no necessity for it. If the majority had taken steps to protect the language and culture, then certainly this agitation would not have been there. We want this in order to preserve our culture and language, and nothing beyond it. If the majority says that it would kill it, then it is the business, or I should say, it is the duty of the younger son of the same mother to stand up and save the mother strangled by the elder brother, simply for the reason that he was born of the same womb. If the majority accuse us of communalism or any other 'ism', then certainly the Sikhs must be shown some sympathy and some consideration because they are taking the right path and not the wrong path. In the end, Sir, whatever else we might be—you may not give us a Punjabi-speaking Province, you may treat us as you like—please do not dub us as communalists. We are nationalists to the core, first and last.

श्री टंडन : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राजनीति में भी मेरी यह मान्यता है कि जो वचन दिया जाय उसकी रक्षा की जाय। आज ही सवेरे में एक समाचार पढ़ रहा था जिस में अमरीका की कुछ चर्चा थी और लेखक ने यह टिप्पणी की थी कि चुनाव में जो वचन दिये जाते हैं उनका प्रायः यह मतलब नहीं होता कि उनके अनुसार काम किया जाय। यह पश्चिमी राजनीति का क्रम हो सकता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि आजकल हम पश्चिम की नकल करने में बहुत लगे हैं लेकिन फिर भी मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जहाँ तक नैतिकता का और वचन पालने का सम्बन्ध है हमें अपने इस प्राचीन क्रम पर रहना चाहिये कि

“प्राण जाहि बर वचन न जाहीं।”

मैं यह केवल वैयक्तिक कर्तव्य नहीं किन्तु दलों का कर्तव्य भी समझता हूँ।

कांग्रेस ने इस विषय में बचन दिया है। मैं एक कांग्रेसी के रूप में आज भी अंगद के पैर की भांति उस पर डटा रहना चाहता हूँ। मेरा पैर आज उस से खिसकने वाला नहीं है। जो बचन हमने दिया है और कई वर्षों में हमने अच्छी तरह से विचार करके जो नीति स्थिर की है कि हम भाषावार प्रदेश बनायेंगे, उससे अणु मात्र भी, एक इंच भर भी, हटना मुझको उचित नहीं लगता। मैं तो अपने को एक कांग्रेसी होने के नाते बचन से बंधा पाता हूँ। इस कारण से जो मांग कि आंध्र प्रदेश की या कन्नड प्रदेश की रही है मेरी उसके साथ पूरी सहानुभूति है। मैं स्वयं उनको बचन दे चुका हूँ। कन्नड प्रदेश के भाई मुझको जानते हैं। कांग्रेस के सभापति की हैसियत से आंध्र में जाने का अवसर तो मुझे नहीं पड़ा था परन्तु मैं कन्नड प्रदेश में घूमा था। मैं ने वहां देखा कि कितनी दृढ़ता के साथ वहां के भाईयों की यह इच्छा है कि वह प्रदेश अलग किया जाय और मैसूर के साथ उनका मेल हो।

मैं ने सभापति होने के नाते उनको पूरा आश्वासन इस बात का दिया था कि उन की मांग को कांग्रेस ठीक समझती है। आज भी हमें वहीं रहना है और मेरा विश्वास है कि कांग्रेस वहीं है। परन्तु यह प्रस्ताव जो आया है उसको तो कांग्रेस दल स्वीकार नहीं करेगा। जिन भाई ने यह प्रस्ताव दिया है जिस पर हम ने इतनी चर्चा की है उन को एक मित्र के नाते एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। जो कुछ उनकी मांग है उसके साथ पूरी सहानुभूति रखने वाले के नाते उनसे यह कहूंगा कि वह जो चाहते थे कि इस विषय पर सरकार का ध्यान खींचा जाय वह बात लगभग पूरी हो गई और इस विषय पर काफी बहस हुई, लेकिन वह इस

विषय पर मत लिये जाने का यत्न न करें। बहस होने के बाद प्रस्ताव को वापिस लें लें। जहां तक कांग्रेस दल का सम्बन्ध है, वह पुराने बचन से बन्धा हुआ है, वह भाग नहीं सकता। लेकिन इस समय वह इस प्रस्ताव का पक्ष नहीं करेगा, यह आपको मालूम है। इसलिये मैं आपको यह सलाह दूंगा कि आप इस समय उससे नहीं न करावें।

मैं गवर्नमेंट को भी सलाह देता हूँ कि इस मामले में अधिक देर नहीं होनी चाहिये। मेरा तो विश्वास भी है कि वह इस विषय पर विचार कर रही है किन्तु मैं उसके अन्दर की बात जानता नहीं, मैं उसको यह सलाह देना चाहता हूँ कि जितनी भी जल्दी हो सके, वह इस प्रश्न को उठावे। मुझको ऐसा लगता है कि इसमें बहुत अधिक कठिनाइयां नहीं हैं। कुछ होंगी तो कुछ न कुछ कठिनाइयां तो सब प्रश्नों के साथ होती हैं। उनका वह सामना करे और उनको वह हल करे।

मेरे पास बैठे हुए भाई श्री गोविन्द दास ने इस बात की चर्चा की कि मराठी भाषा प्रान्त को बनाने में संभव है मध्यप्रदेश को उत्तरप्रदेश के कुछ जिलों के लेने की आवश्यकता पड़े और कुछ सदस्यों की ओर से नहीं की आवाज आई। इस प्रकार की कुछ बातें कभी कभी होती रहती हैं, लेकिन मैं श्री गोविन्द दास को आश्वासन देता हूँ कि हम अपने उत्तरप्रदेश में कभी इस बात के इच्छुक नहीं रहे हैं कि हमारा प्रदेश बढ़ता चला जाय। उनको मैं इतना बतला सकता हूँ कि उत्तरप्रदेश में कुछ ऐसी बात है, कुछ उस में ऐसा तिलिस्म है जिसके कारण लोग स्वयं ही उस में आना चाहते हैं। उदाहरणार्थ थोड़ा समय हुआ एक प्रश्न उठा था कि विन्ध्यप्रदेश जो एक छोटा सा प्रदेश है, समाप्त हो जाय

[श्री टंडन]

और उसकी प्रथक स्थिति न रहे। मुझे यह पता है कि विन्ध्यप्रदेश के लोगों की इच्छा थी कि हम अलग रहें लेकिन अगर हम समाप्त होते हैं तो हमारा अधिक अंश उत्तर-प्रदेश के साथ जाय। इस इच्छा की कभी भी आप जांच कर सकते हैं। वहां के जो मुखिया लोग थे बंदेलखंड रौबा आदि के उनकी यही इच्छा थी कि यदि किसी दूसरे प्रदेश में उन्हें जाना है तो उत्तरप्रदेश में जायें। अगर वह मध्य प्रदेश के साथ जाते हैं तो हम उनको आवासन देते हैं कि हमारे उत्तरप्रदेश वालों की तरफ से उनको रोकने के लिये कोई यत्न नहीं होगा।

श्री आर० एस० तिवारी : मैं ने कहा था कि विन्ध्यप्रदेश ही एक बड़ा प्रदेश बनाया जाय।

श्री टंडन : हमारे भाई श्री राज बहादुर जो आज गवर्नमेंट के एक अंग हैं इस समय दिखाई नहीं देते उन को यह मालूम है कि जब राजस्थान के बनाने का विषय आया और अलवर और भरतपुर के राजस्थान अथवा उत्तरप्रदेश में जाने का सवाल पेश हुआ तब अलवर और भरतपुर इन दोनों स्थानों के मुखिया लोगों की यह इच्छा थी कि वे उत्तरप्रदेश के साथ जायें। इन दोनों की निश्चित इच्छा की बात मुझे मालूम है। अलवर उस समय मुझे कांग्रेस के काम के सिलसिले में जाना पड़ा था और वहां के भाई और भरतपुर के भाइयों ने मुझसे सलाह मांगी और अपनी स्थिति बढाई कि उनके व्यापारी लोग राजस्थान के साथ नहीं जाना चाहते और उत्तरप्रदेश के साथ आना चाहते हैं क्योंकि उत्तरप्रदेश से उनका पुराना सम्बन्ध है। मैंने यह बात उस समय फलाई नहीं लेकिन अब बता सकता

हूं कि मैंने उन को यह सलाह दी और बहुत बलपूर्वक सलाह दी कि आप उत्तरप्रदेश में आने का यत्न न करें, 'बरन् आप राजस्थान में जायें। मेरा उनको ऐसी सलाह देना अर्थपूर्ण था। मैं चाहता था कि जिन लोगों में सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि है और जिन्होंने उत्तरप्रदेश के सम्पर्क में आकर कुछ भारतीय संस्कृति के अंगों में प्रगति की है, वे राजस्थान के साथ जायें और उस प्रदेश को सांस्कृतिक सहायता दें।

मेरी अत्यधिक इच्छा यह है कि हमारी एक केन्द्रीय संस्कृति भारतीय संस्कृति का फलदायी हो। मेरी यह दृष्टि नहीं है कि हमारे उत्तरप्रदेश की जो सीमा है उसको कुछ और बढ़ालें। यदि इस में से दो जिले दूसरे प्रदेश में जाते हैं तो मैं इस में बाधक होने वाला नहीं हूं। मैं इस बात का पोषक हूं कि भारत की जो अपनी संस्कृति है जिसको मैं भारतीय संस्कृति कहा करता हूं वह चारों ओर फैले वह दुढ़ हो और भारत की एकता की भावना दिन पर दिन हमारे देश में बढ़े। यह मुख्य बात है।

यदि मैं यह समझता कि इन भाषावार प्रदेशों के कारण इस कार्य में कुछ आघात पहुंचेगा उस एकता की भावना को कुछ चोट पहुंचेगी तो मैं भाषावार प्रदेशों का पक्ष कदापि न लेता। लेकिन मेरा हृदय कहता है कि आज छोटी छोटी बातों में कई प्रदेशों को जो कठिनाइयां हो रही हैं वे हट जायेंगी और उन के लिये रास्ता आसान हो जायेगा। मैं अनुभव करता हूं कि मध्यप्रदेश में मराठी और हिन्दी का प्रश्न खड़ा हुआ है, मैं अनुभव करता हूं कि मद्रास प्रदेश में प्रति दिन भाषा सम्बन्धी कठिनाइयां होती हैं; आप चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी भाषा हटे, हिन्दी फैले, लेकिन हिन्दी द्वारा काम करने में उन्हें कठिनाई है

तामिल में बोलें तो उन के लिये कठिनाई है क्योंकि बहुत से लोग उसको नहीं समझेंगे, तैलगू बोली जाय तो दूसरे लोग नहीं समझेंगे, इसी प्रकार कन्नड़ और मलयालम में कठिनाई होती है। परिणाम यह होता है कि अंग्रेजी चली आती है। इसी प्रकार और स्थानों में कठिनाई है। बम्बई वालों ने कहा कि जो उनकी भाषायें हैं वे जिलों के स्तर पर चलें और ऊपर के स्तर पर हिन्दी चले। यह स्वाभाविक ही था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक हो हम यह सुविधा दें कि जनता अपनी अपनी विधान सभाओं में अपनी भाषा में बोल सकें। हमको अपने उत्तर प्रदेश में तनिक भी कठिनाई नहीं है। फ़ारसी लिपि हम पर अंग्रेजों की कृपा से लाद दी गई थी, कुछ पहले से भी थी। हम उससे छुटकारा पा गये। हम ईश्वर को धन्यवाद देते हैं कि वहां हिन्दू, मुसलमान सब मिल कर हिन्दी भाषा में और एक भारतीय लिपि अर्थात् नागरी लिपि में अपना कार्य कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लाभ हम को है वही लाभ हमारी भाषा की जो बहनें हैं वह उठाये और दूसरे प्रदेशों के रहने वाले भाई भी स्वाधीन होकर उसी ढंग से एक भाषा में अपना काम कर सकें।

मेरी पूरी सहानुभूति उन लोगों के साथ है जो इस काम में शीघ्रता कराना चाहते हैं। लेकिन आज इस प्रस्ताव के स्वीकार न करने के पक्ष में हमारे दल का निश्चय है। मैं भी उसके साथ हूँ। किन्तु मैं अपने माननीय मंत्री जी को और गवर्नमेंट को यह सुझाव देता हूँ कि जहां तक हों सके इस मामले में देरी न करें। उससे हमारे देश को कोई हानि पहुंचेगी ऐसा कोई भय न करें। इससे लाभ ही होगा और लोगों की भावनायें हमारे साथ आयेंगी। जितनी

जल्दी हो सके गवर्नमेंट इस कार्य को उठा ले यही मेरा कहना है।

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Sir, the question be now put.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall allow one more speaker and call on the hon. Minister at 15 minutes to one o'clock.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: By the speech of Shri Tandonji the position of the Congress Party has been made abundantly clear. (*An Hon. Member:* Are you not in the Congress Party?) Has my hon. friend got his head on his shoulders? I am very glad that the hon. Prime Minister had also clarified the whole issue. He has not allowed himself to be influenced on the one hand by the extreme views expressed so strongly by Mr. Frank Anthony who seems to be a sworn enemy of linguistic provinces and on the other he has not allowed himself to become a supporter of the resolution which seeks that the Government should take a red pencil in hand and draw out linguistic provinces all over the face of India, so as to change the boundaries of almost every existing state.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Not red pencil but blue pencil.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I do not expect the result would change with the colour of the pencil. The hon. Prime Minister has taken a realistic attitude. He has told us that the Congress is committed to this principle; that he is himself committed to it. Although ideally speaking he thinks that it would not be a very desirable thing, he does not oppose it. Not only that. He is prepared to go ahead with it. He is prepared to assist wherever assistance is called for and is likely to be helpful.

The other day when my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram was speaking, he was in difficulties so far as a description of himself was concerned. I helped him by calling him a 'lingua maniac'. (Today I would give him a better compliment and say that instead of being called 'Lanka Sundaram' he may be called 'lingua Sundaram'. (*An Hon. Member:* What are you?) I am neither a lingua maniac nor a lingua fad, phil, nor phobe; nor a lingua Sundaram.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): But my hon. friend is a maniac for raw cotton.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I agree. I accept the compliment.

I am a practical man who thinks in a realistic manner. Ideally speaking, I would also agree with the hon. Prime Minister that there should have been no question of linguistic provinces, that we should have for the whole of India seventy or eighty provinces, each one of them containing a population of forty or fifty lakhs, having no legislatures of their own, but there being only one judiciary, one police, one law and one legislature for the whole country. That would be the ideal position. Unfortunately, due to the dependence and slavery to which we were subjected, we are faced with different problems. We cannot undo history all of a sudden. When freedom dawned, we had to take certain things for granted and work on that basis. Speaking today after a few years of freedom, when we have consolidated our position and are now safe, the formation of linguistic provinces is inevitable. Linguistic provinces must and shall come, and if they come it will lead to the all round progress of the country. There should be no fear, as Tandonji pointed out, of fissiparous tendencies. I think the hon. Prime Minister and his Government ought to trust the commonsense and the patriotism of the people a little more than they do. I have not the shadow of a doubt that if we have provinces speaking one language only, it will not lead to any of these tendencies.

So far as Maharashtra is concerned, it is tragic that Marathi should be a language which has no homeland of its own. No other language has such a history as Marathi has and in these days we are careful not to utter the word 'Maratha'. We call ourselves 'Maharashtrians', lest there be any fear or nervousness created in the minds of the people in other parts of India that in our conquering attitude we may invade them and conquer the whole of India. I assure my hon. friends in the other parts of India that we have no such intention. (Interruption) That is a thing of the past.

So far as Bombay is concerned, nobody shall touch it. For sixty miles in the north, we have Marathi-speaking people. My Gujarati friends say that Bombay has been built by their money. If Bombay has been built by their money, let me say that Bombay was built by the blood of the Maharashtrians. In this speech I do not want to go so far as to refer to the historic fact that it is with the blood of Maharashtrians that we have saved our *gandh*, our *choti* and our *yagnopavit*.

बी माडगिल : शिवाजी न होते तो
सुन्नत होत सबकी ।

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: We cannot forget the fact that Bombay has been built by the blood of the Maharashtrians and it will not be possible for anybody to deprive them of Bombay city by adopting any stratagems. My friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram said that because he cannot get Madras city, he is prepared to go without Madras and Madras, Bombay and even Nagpur could be formed into separate States. He acted according to a Marathi proverb

हस बायाचे धरावर तुलसी पत्र

Being charitable at the cost of the sweet meat seller.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I did not say so.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: He has no courage to say he must have Madras. He said that with or without Madras, somehow he wanted the Andhra Province.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I said I would never surrender Madras.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: He exhibited his lack of courage, Sir. These things can only come about if you are convinced yourself. His saying that Bombay can be converted into a separate province is not a practical proposition. I want that Sanyukta Maharashtra should be immediately carved out. I know there are difficulties. I am fully conscious of them. My friends of the Opposition may not be conscious of them. There are difficulties. We quarrel among ourselves. There are various groups suggesting all sorts of things which are irreconcilable, one with the other. But we should not be daunted by them.

If for any reason Sanyukta Maharashtra is postponed for some time we should separate the Marathi and the Hindi-speaking areas in Madhya Pradesh immediately. In the Dar Committee report it has been clearly stated that if there is one point on which all sections are agreed it is that the Marathi-speaking area must be separated from the Hindi-speaking area. There is no dispute about this. Therefore, it would be well if the Prime Minister says that he is prepared to go ahead. The best thing he can do is to separate the Marathi-speaking portion of more than eighty lakhs of people at least, with a revenue of near about eight to nine crores of rupees on the present calculation, a homogeneous entity, a cotton growing area which will make India self-sufficient in cotton and from it as an

independent State. I assure the Prime Minister that there is no difficulty whatsoever standing in the way of the carving of this province. We shall be self-sufficient and we shall be very happy if this is done. Some time back the M. P. Legislative Assembly passed a unanimous resolution approving this. I submit that there is therefore no difficulty of any sort in the way. Even the Dar Committee has said that this is a demand of the people and that they are unanimous. I shall close with this because there is no time, although I have much to say.

Dr. Katju: The Prime Minister spoke at some length on the previous occasion and dealt with all the points that had been raised by the speakers on that day. This morning we have had a very strenuous debate and we have heard numerous points of view which have been pressed with great vehemence. I suggest respectfully that this morning's debate has given a very good reason and a very good justification for the point of view expressed by the Prime Minister. I am speaking, shall I say, as an Indian because I am personally in touch with very many States. The Bengalis would have me a Bengali. If the Oriyas would accept me (*Shri B. Das*: We will, gladly). I am an Oriya. I am also an Assamese and a Bihari. Of course, I cannot claim to be a Marathi. I am also a Madhyabharati. I am a Rajasthani by marriage, a Punjabi by education, and what I am from Uttar Pradesh. So in this matter I speak with some detachment.

What struck me this morning was that while so many points had been expressed, namely that the Congress is committed to linguistic provinces and in carrying out that pledge you should bear in mind economic considerations, cultural considerations, physical or geographical considerations and so on, one big point on which the Prime Minister laid stress was not stressed so much, namely the unity of India, the unification of India. It is not a question in principle as to whether the thing is good or not good. Everybody agrees. The Congress is committed to it for the last thirty years. As a matter of fact the Congress divided its own organisation on a linguistic basis. The cry of linguistic provinces has been raised by the Congress itself. But today, in 1952, it is no use reading, as my hon. friend Mr. Gopalan does, the resolutions of 1946 and 1931 or even of 1948. Today the need of the moment is that having regard to the context of world conditions, nothing should be done to induce

dissidence or divergence of opinions in the body politic. But, as I said, the very debate of this morning would show that. If a Boundary Commission were to be established I can understand the parties being agreed on broad points and there may be only questions of five villages here or five villages there, a sub-division or a taluka and so on, those are minor points. We are all here very responsible people and hon. Members were all speaking with restraint. But there is a great volume of opinion and a great difference of opinion. So, while we have got to tackle this problem—and as my hon. friend *Shri Tandonji* has said, we have got to do it and do it as quickly as we can—we have got to bear in mind the world context and the fact that when the whole international situation is in a fluid condition, we here in India should not have differences. My hon. friends raised all sorts of questions.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): We want unity in diversity.

Dr. Katju: Is it desirable that by establishing Boundary Commissions or by starting upon this quest for establishing linguistic provinces we should among ourselves raise great controversies on which the people might be divided? I am speaking, as I said, not in a party spirit but, if I may say so again, from a very broad point of view. Because having been in Bengal for more than three years I have noticed the very intense feeling on this point. There are the refugees coming from East Bengal, and do what you may they will not go elsewhere. They will not go to Orissa, Bihar, Punjab, Hyderabad and so on. Some families may go, if you give them land, to the Andamans. But they will not go elsewhere. It is a very difficult question we have to tackle. But the question is: Is this the time? Cannot we wait—five years, six years, four years? And I suggest to you patience is necessary. There is no emergency, emergency in the sense that here is a typhoid patient and unless you give him some penicillin immediately he cannot be saved.

About Orissa I came across one instance which I should like to mention here. I do not know whether many Members are aware of it. You know the district of Sambalpur. That was originally a part of the Central Provinces. Sambalpur, I think, has a majority of people speaking Oriya. But it was formerly attached to the Central Provinces. I came across in the official papers a long controversy, correspondence, letters being sent repeatedly during the course of thirty

[Dr. Katju]

or forty years by the Lieutenant-Governor or the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces to the Government of India "Inasmuch as this is an Oriya-speaking area I cannot manage it". And in those days Orissa was a part of undivided Bengal and the whole of Orissa was one division, Orissa Division as it was called. And the Lieutenant-Governor of undivided Bengal was saying again and again "I do not want to have it because I cannot properly manage it". It went on for thirty or forty years. Ultimately the Lieutenant-Governor of the Central Provinces said "I cannot manage it; please have it" and finally the Government of India really forced a decision upon Bengal and Sambalpur came along to Bengal and was merged in the Orissa Division, which formerly consisted of four districts and then it became five. Nobody said a single word. The administrative convenience is there. The cultural convenience, if I may say so, is there. But this great factor, the preservation of the unity and security of India and of doing nothing which instead of promoting ideas of unity will promote divergences of opinion and dissidence of opinion and rivalries at this moment, is of vital importance.

I should like to mention one thing more. Ours is a very big country with lots of dialects and regional languages but I am thinking of that day—and we must all think of it—when every one of us here should be able to go out into different States and appeal to the masses direct and not through English. I should like to be in a position to go, say to Malabar or Cochin, and address any gathering and be able to appeal to the masses direct. Therefore, nationhood requires a national language. I do not want to go here into the question of what is to be the national language and what not. But I want to appeal to you that before you embark on a large-scale campaign of linguistic division you should also take care to see that the national language should also grow side by side, so that while among the States people there should be cultural coherence and unity of thought inside the State itself there should be fostered the great all-India unity. Today in order to make myself understood I am speaking in the English language. My hon. friends who speak in Hindi do not make themselves understood to 20 per cent. of the Members. If I go to Malabar or Madras I have to speak in English but English will not remain and cannot remain here. Therefore, something

must be substituted and before that substitution takes place if we start on a large-scale, simultaneous and hurried division of the country in your passion for linguistic provinces (An Hon. Member: It will help.) there is the great danger of a breakup or dissolution of the country. I want to prevent it. I do not say that when the States are constituted on a linguistic basis they would not be very anxious for the promotion of the national language, whatever it may be. However, the Constitution has decided it and something must be done on those lines. Stressing too much upon the division of India, redistribution of the states of India, or the formation of linguistic provinces—Goodness knows how it would work out as between Bengal and Bihar or as between any other States. There are all kinds of questions arising therefrom and I do not want to go into them. But these are the two great factors which should be borne in mind. One is the preservation of the unity of India at all cost or the integration of India as a whole. We do not want to endanger it on any ground whatsoever. Secondly, apart from preservation of the unity, we want that that unity should be promoted by common intercourse, a common national language and a common—shall I say—desire to mix with each other.

I do not want to take up any more time of the House. Every point of view has been expressed and the views of the Government are very well known. We desire administrative convenience and so far as linguistic provinces promote that administrative convenience, subject to financial, economic and other considerations, it might be considered.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Sir, the other day I put a question to the hon. Prime Minister regarding the Partition Committee. That has not been answered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more questions now. There are many questions which are not answered. I will now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that necessary action should be taken immediately to regroup the existing States in South India on sound economic and linguistic principles and an impartial Boundary Commission should be

established consisting of ministers, members of the legislatures and officials to re-draw the boundaries accordingly."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That after the words "opinion that" the following be inserted:

"a time has come for the redistribution of provinces on linguistic basis with a view to ensure opportunity for homogeneous, social, cultural and economic development of the different provinces and therefore"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That after the words "linguistic basis" the following be inserted:

"keeping in view the economic viability, geographical contiguity and cultural affinity".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That after the words "linguistic basis" the following be inserted:

"keeping in view the considerations of defence and financial self-sufficiency".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for all the words occurring after the words "linguistic basis" to the end the following be substituted:

"and that to begin with Hyderabad State should be disintegrated into three parts namely Karnatak, Andhra and Maharashtra and the boundaries of the proposed linguistic provinces in general should be readjusted in accordance with the majority of the opinion as exercised by votes on adult franchise in the respective areas."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the words "and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly" the following be substituted:

"and that a commission be appointed forthwith to take up the question of rectification of boundaries in the provinces of Northern India."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the words "and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly" the following be substituted:

"and that a Boundary Commission be appointed to report to Parliament as to how the boundaries of the States should be readjusted or re-distributed keeping in view the consideration of economy, defence, geographical contiguity and cultural affinity"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That after the words "existing States" the words "including those of Northern India" be inserted.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That after the word "readjusted" the words "without insisting on the agreement on the part of regional units concerned" be inserted.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the following be added at the end:

"keeping in view administrative convenience, economic viability and geographical contiguity."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the following be added at the end:

"by appointing a boundary Commission".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the following be added at the end:

"and for that purpose a high-powered commission be appointed to decide the future of territories over which there is controversy between any two of the new States."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the following be added at the end:

"This House is further of opinion that the State of Hyderabad be forthwith disintegrated and its different linguistic parts be integrated with the adjoining similar linguistic units."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the following be added at the end:

"and that in view of the changed circumstances arising out of the

Mayurbhanj in Orissa and consequent geographical contiguity, Seraikella and Kharswan be immediately restored to Orissa in

accordance with the terms of the merger agreements."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the original resolution. The question is:

"This House is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken to redistribute the States on a linguistic basis and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly."

The House divided: Ayes, 77: Noes, 261.

AYES

Division No- 10]

[1 P.M.]

Achalu, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Amjad Ali, Jonab
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Biren Dutt, Shri
Boovaraghasamy, Shri
Buchhikotalah, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri Tuskar
Chattopadhyaya, Shri
Chandhuri, Shri T. K.
Chowdary, Shri C. B.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Dasaratha Deb, Shri
Deo, Shri B. N. S.
Deshpande, Shri V. G.
Gam Malludora, Shri
Girdhari Bhoi, Shri
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gurupadaswamy, Shri
Hukam Singh, Sardar
Jaiscoorya, Dr.

Jayaraman, Shri
Kachiroyar, Shri
Kandasamy, Shri
Kelappan, Shri
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Lal Singh, Sardar
Mahata, Shri B.
Majhi, Shri Chaitan
Menon, Shri Damodara
Mishra, Pandit S. C.
Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
More, Shri S. S.
Muniswamy, Shri
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Mushar, Shri
Naidu, Shri N. R.
Nair, Shri N. S.
Nanadas, Shri
Nesamony, Shri
Pocker Saheb, Shri
Punnoose, Shri
Raghavachari, Shri
Raghavalah, Shri
Rajabhoj, Shri
Ramaseshalah, Shri

Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
Randaman Singh, Shri
Rao, Dr. Rama
Rao, Shri Gopala
Rao, Shri K. S.
Rao, Shri P. R.
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Mohana
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Rao, Shri Vittal
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Reddi, Shri Ramachandra
Reddy, Shri Eswara
Rishang Kelshing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Shakuntala, Shrimati
Singh Shri R. N.
Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Swamy, Shri N. B. M.
Vallatharas, Shri
Velayudhan, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Shri H. L.
Agrawal, Shri M. L.
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Asthana, Shri
Balasubramaniam, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Bansal, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. B.
Bhakta Darshan, Shri
Bharati, Shri G. S.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das

Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C. S.
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bhonsle, Major-General
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Bogawat, Shri
Borooh, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brohmo-Choudhury, Shri
Buragohain, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Charak, Shri
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri

Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri Nagappa
Chaudhry, Shri M. Shafi
Dabhi, Shri
Damar, Shri
Damodaran, Shri G. B.
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Ram Dhan
Das, Shri Ramananda
Das, Shri N. T.
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri S. C.
Deogam, Shri
Desai, Shri K. N.
Deshmukh, Shri C. D.

Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
 Deshpande, Shri G. H.
 Dholakia, Shri
 Dhulekar, Shri
 Dhusiya, Shri
 Digambar Singh, Shri
 Dube, Shri U. S.
 Dubey, Shri B. G.
 Dutta, Shri S. K.
 Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
 Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
 Ebenezzer, Dr.
 Elayaperumal, Shri
 Fotedar, Pandit
 Gadgil, Shri
 Gandhi, Shri Feroze
 Gandhi, Shri M. M.
 Ganpati Ram, Shri
 Ghose, Shri S. M.
 Ghosh, Shri A.
 Giri, Shri V. V.
 Gounder, Shri K. P.
 Gounder, Shri K. S.
 Govind Das, Seth
 Gupta, Shri Badshah
 Hari Mohan, Dr.
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Heda, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Hembrom, Shri
 Hyder Hussain, Ch.
 Ibrahim, Shri
 Islamuddin, Shri M.
 Iyyani, Shri E.
 Iyyunni, Shri C. R.
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jatav-vir, Shri
 Jayashri, Shrimati
 Jha, Shri Bhagwat
 Jhunhunwala, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Jethalal
 Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
 Joshi, Shri Liladhar
 Joshi, Shri M. D.
 Joshi, Shri N. L.
 Kakkan, Shri
 Kale, Shrimati A.
 Kamble, Shri
 Kanungo, Shri
 Karmarkar, Shri
 Katham, Shri
 Katju, Dr.
 Keshavalengar, Shri
 Keskar, Dr.
 Khedkar, Shri G. B.
 Khongmen, Shrimati
 Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
 Kirolikar, Shri
 Kolay, Shri

Krishna Chandra, Shri
 Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kureel, Shri P. L.
 Lal, Shri B. S.
 Lallanji, Shri
 Lakshmayya, Shri
 Laskar, Prof.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Madiah Gowda, Shri
 Mahodaya, Shri
 Mahtab, Shri
 Majhi, Shri B. C.
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Malliah, Shri U. S.
 Malvia, Shri B. N.
 Malviya, Pandit C. N.
 Malviya, Shri Motilal
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Masuodi, Maulana
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Mathew, Prof.
 Maydeo, Shrimati
 Mehta, Shri A. L.
 Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri M. P.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Pandit Lingaraj
 Misra, Shri B. N.
 Misra, Shri B. D.
 Misra, Shri S. P.
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Muchaki Kosa, Shri
 Mudaliar Shri C. R.
 Musafir, Giani G. S.
 Muthukrishnan, Shri
 Namdhari, Shri
 Narasimhan, Shri C. B.
 Naskar, Shri P. S.
 Natawadkar, Shri
 Nathwani, Shri N. P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Newvi, Shri
 Nijalingappa, Shri
 Pannalal, Shri
 Pant, Shri D. D.
 Parikh, Shri S. G.
 Parmar, Shri R. B.
 Pataskar, Shri
 Patel, Shri B. K.
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Patil, Bhau Saheb
 Patil, Shri Shankargauda
 Pawar, Shri V. P.
 Prabhakar, Shri N.

Prasad, Shri H. S.
 Rachiah, Shri N.
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghubir Sahai, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Raj Bahader, Shri
 Ram Das, Shri
 Ram Saran, Prof.
 Ram Subhaz Singh, Dr.
 Ranbir Singh, Ch.
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Diwan Raghavendra
 Rao, Shri B. Shiva
 Rao, Shri Seethagiri
 Reddy, Shri H. S.
 Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
 Roy, Dr. Satyaban
 Rup Narain, Shri
 Sahaya, Shri Syamannandan
 Sahu, Shri Bhagabat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar A. S.
 Sakkena, Shri Mohanlal
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sanganna, Shri
 Sankarapandian, Shri
 Sarmah, Shri
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Satyawadi, Dr.
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Shah, Shri B. B.
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. B.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Sivananjappa, Shri
 Shobha Ram, Shri
 Siddananjappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri Babunath
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. J.
 Singh Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Dr. S.
 Sinha, Shri C. N. P.
 Sinha, Shri G. P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha Shri K. P.
 Sinha, Shri N. P.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Siva, Dr. Gangadhara
 Somana, Shri N.
 Somani, Shri G. D.
 Soren, Shri
 Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
 Suriya Prasad, Shri
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.
 Tandon, Shri
 Telikar, Shri

Tewari, Sardar B. B. S.
 Thimuzelah, Shri
 Thomas Shri A. M.
 Thomas, Shri A. V.
 Tivari, Shri V. K.
 Tiwari, Shri B. S.
 Tripathi, Shri K. P.
 Tripathi, Shri V. D.
 Tudu, Shri B. L.

Tutidna, Shri
 Ulkey, Shri
 Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Daya
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Valshnav, Shri H. G.
 Valshya, Shri M. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Varma, Shri B. R.
 Vartak, Shri

Veakataraman, Shri
 Vidyalkar, Shri
 Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
 Vishwanath Prasad, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhela
 Wodeyar, Shri

The motion was negatived.

The House then adjourned till a
 Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on

Monday, the 14th July 1952